

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8357

Prison System" as proposed by the House instead of \$4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 34: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$293,000 for "Registration and voting statistics, Bureau of the Census." This item was disallowed without prejudice, the conferees feeling that the matter should be settled at a later date after action has been taken on pending voting-rights legislation. The amount proposed in the amendment would have been available for only two months—an insufficient period of time to accomplish worthwhile results, and a greater sum, as proposed in the budget estimate would have been subject to a point of order.

Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$25,000 for "salaries and expenses" instead of \$50,938 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees further agreed with the statement in the Senate Report (No. 167) to wit: "the Committee directs that the Commission not incur any obligations payable with appropriated funds on or after May 1, 1965".

United States Information Agency

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$0,000 for "Special International Exhibitions" instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$11,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; and deletes the Senate proposal to allow \$25,000 for representation and entertainment expenses.

TITLE II

Appalachian regional development

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$100,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Research" as proposed by the House instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate. No funds are provided for planning a fruit and berry laboratory.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate \$300,000 for "Payments and expenses, Cooperative State Research Service" instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and permit its use for contracts and grants for basic and applied research.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate \$750,000 for "Cooperative extension work, Payments and expenses" instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$1,575,000 for "Conservation operations" instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$600,000 for "Watershed planning" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriate \$10,220,000 for "Watershed protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provide \$3,100,000 for loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Economic Research Service" instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$325,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Farmers Home Administration" instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$7,100,000 for the "Direct loan account" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$50,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Rural Community

Development Service" instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 50, 51 and 52: Appropriate \$2,000,000 for "Forest land management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House; authorize \$1,000,000 for acquisition of land as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House; also appropriate \$1,225,000 for "Forest research" instead of \$1,125,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense—Civil

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$14,153,000 for "Construction, general, Corps of Engineers" instead of \$13,778,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides \$375,000 for small flood control projects as proposed by the Senate, but disallows the amount of \$547,000 for recreation facilities which was added by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 54: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for "Appalachian Region Mining Area Restoration" instead of \$15,850,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed provides \$500,000 for evaluation study instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$350,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,350,000 for Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as proposed by the House instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III

Increased pay costs

Amendments Nos. 57-67: Appropriate \$3,426,445 for increased costs of various Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV

Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Appropriate \$31,411,444 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,643,495 as proposed by the House; and include the items set forth in Senate Document No. 19.

GEORGE MAHON,

ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL

Managers on the Part of the House.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its 14th conference to be held in Puerto Rico.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 349

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association was organized at Washington, District of Columbia, May 16, 1940, and is now celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding; and

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its fourteenth conference at San Juan, Puerto Rico, during the period May 22-29, 1965; and

Whereas this is the first time that the Inter-American Bar Association has planned a conference in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas three previous conferences of the association have been held in the United States; and

Whereas the purposes of the association, as stated in its constitution, are to establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views, and to encourage cordial intercourse and fellowship among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the high character of this international association, its deliberations, and its members can do much to encourage understanding, friendship, and cordial relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas there were adopted by the Eightieth Congress, in its second session, and by the Eighty-sixth Congress, in its first session, concurrent resolutions of welcome and good wishes to the Inter-American Bar Association on the occasion of its holding conferences in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association during its fourteenth conference to be held in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and wishes the association outstanding success in accomplishing its purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the secretary general of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its 14th conference in San Juan, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, May 22 to May 29, 1965. Approximately, 1,500 lawyers, representing the Inter-American Bar Association and coming from the United States, from Canada, and from the various Latin American countries, will attend the conference.

We, in Puerto Rico, are highly honored that this distinguished group has chosen to visit us on this occasion.

House Concurrent Resolution 349 would recognize the 14th conference of

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 28, 1965

the Inter-American Bar Association and the 25th anniversary of the founding of the association and would extend welcome and good wishes for the outstanding success of the association in accomplishing its purposes.

Similar action was taken by the 86th Congress, 1st session, and by the 88th Congress, 2d session, by similar concurrent resolutions.

I hope that our colleagues will unanimously support House Concurrent Resolution 349, which appears fitting and appropriate at this time.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I commend and thank my colleagues for the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 349 of which our distinguished colleague, Mr. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico is the author, and of which I have a companion resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 354, expressing the welcome of the Congress of the United States to the Inter-American Bar Association to its 14th conference to be held at the beautiful city of San Juan in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, May 22-29. The Inter-American Bar Association composed of members of the bar of the United States and all the Latin American countries excepting Cuba, of course, while it retains its Communist character, who banded together for the development of the law and legal institutions to forward the peace and the prosperity of the Americas. I am proud to be a member of the Inter-American Bar Association and to have attended the Inter-American Bar Association Conference in Bogota some 4 years ago. I look forward with particular pleasure to attending the impending conference in San Juan.

Today, as we seek to establish peace through law and to build a world governed by law it is essential that we emphasize the role of the law in the building of a peaceful and a better world. Lawyers have always been the architects of institutions to progress the cause of peace and a better life for mankind. Today the troubled and still, I regret to say, lawless world challenges the genius of the lawyers of all lands who believe in the supremacy of law over the conduct of nations as well as men. The lawyers of the Western Hemisphere have much to offer in the building of such institutions. The Honorable Roy Ballant, of Washington, D.C., founder of the Inter-American Bar Association, is to be commended for bringing the lawyers of the free nations of our Hemisphere, except Canada, into this Inter-American Bar Association. Much good has this association accomplished. Greater accomplishments lie ahead for it.

I am sure the San Juan Conference in the inspiring Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will do much to hasten the day of which Mr. Justice Jackson spoke in his

opening statement at the Nuremberg trials when "every man shall live by no man's leave underneath the law."

VIETNAM SITUATION

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I command the attention of the Members of this great body to the remarks made by the President of the United States on yesterday at his press conference relative to the crisis in Vietnam. This, of course, has been a subject of continuing discussion on the part of the American people.

The President on yesterday, Mr. Speaker, spelled out the policy of this Government to maintain freedom in that part of the world and elsewhere against Communist aggression. He restated the policy first laid down in his speech at Baltimore recently. To those who have been critical of our policy, I suggest that they read the press conference statement in full. I know that Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, have generally supported the position taken by the President. And I am happy to note that in public opinion polls taken in depth throughout the Nation very recently, the American people support the President of the United States.

The foreign policy of our Government must indeed be a bipartisan foreign policy and I hope the American people generally will read this statement and understand the issue before our Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana in the statement he is making and I associate myself with his remarks. In his statement yesterday the President once again enunciated the aims and aspirations of the United States with respect to the crucial struggle in Vietnam. He stressed our determination to help a free country remain free. He stressed yet again that our fundamental purpose is to achieve a peaceful settlement that will permit the people of this area to live their lives in freedom and security. I would like to associate myself with this objective and under leave to extend my remarks I include the statement made by the President on yesterday:

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

We are engaged in a crucial struggle in Vietnam.

Some may consider it a small war. But to the men who give their lives, it is the last war. And the stakes are huge.

Independent South Vietnam has been attacked by North Vietnam. The objective of that attack is conquest.

Defeat in South Vietnam would be to deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations within their reach. Our own welfare and our own freedom would be in danger.

This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only great-

er threats—and more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace.

At every step of the way we have used our great power with the utmost restraint. We have made every effort to find a peaceful solution.

We have done this in the face of the most outrageous and brutal provocation against Vietnamese and Americans alike.

Through the first 7 months of 1964, both Vietnamese and Americans were the targets of constant acts of terror. Bombs exploded in helpless villages, in downtown movie theaters, even at a sports field. Soldiers and civilians, men and women, were murdered and crippled. Yet we took no action against the source of this brutality—North Vietnam.

When our destroyers were attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin, we replied with a single raid. The punishment was limited to the dead.

For the next 6 months we took no action against North Vietnam. We warned of danger; we hoped for caution in others.

The answer was attack, and explosions, and indiscriminate murder.

It soon became clear that our restraint was viewed as weakness. Our desire to limit conflict was viewed as a prelude to surrender. We could no longer stand by while attack mounted; and while the bases of the attackers were immune from reply.

And so, we began to strike back. But we have not changed our essential purpose. That purpose is peaceful settlement. That purpose is to resist aggression. That purpose is to avoid wider war.

I say again that I will talk to any government, anywhere, and without any conditions; if any doubt our sincerity, let them test it.

Each time we have met with silence, slander, or the sound of guns.

But just as we will not flag in battle, we will not weary in the search for peace.

I reaffirm my offer of unconditional discussions. We will discuss any subject, and any point of view, with any government concerned.

This offer may be rejected, as it has been in the past. But it will remain open; waiting for the day when it becomes clear to all that armed attack will not yield domination over others.

And I will continue along the course we have set; firmness with moderation; readiness for peace with refusal to retreat.

For this is the same battle which we have fought for a generation. Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace restored, and liberty maintained.

This was true under President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy.

And it will be true again in southeast Asia.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the gentleman from Louisiana has noted, both privately and publicly I have supported the President's present firm policy in Vietnam. It is also fair to state that all Members of our party on this side of the aisle in the House have supported the present course of action in Vietnam. This is a critical and serious situation that demands our maximum strength both at home and in Vietnam. In this instance particularly, I feel we should have a very high degree of bipartisanship in order to convince the opponents, the Communists, that they should not miscalculate the intentions of America. If

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8359

they miscalculate because of statements made by any public officials the dangers to all mankind could be significantly increased. Consequently I call upon all Americans, particularly those in elected office in the Federal Congress, to stand firm and steadfast against Communist aggression in southeast Asia or elsewhere.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him and his colleagues of his party for their statesmanship.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO AN ELDER STATESMAN

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, although this day has not been declared a national holiday, it should not go by without our observing that it was on this day, April 28, 83 years ago, that a great American and an elder statesman was born—a man younger and more agile in mind and spirit than many a man half his age—our eminent colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA.

A man of tremendous driving force and energy, he continues to serve his Nation and his constituents with amazing vigor. He possesses those indispensable elements of statesmanship, independence, and personal courage. He never hesitates to speak out on his personal convictions, whatever the trend of current public opinion may be.

We in this Chamber have often sat spellbound by the force and eloquence of his speeches.

Few men in public life possess the wealth of experience in diverse fields that BARRATT O'HARA possesses—in journalism, radio broadcasting, law, politics, and military.

BARRATT O'HARA has distinguished himself as one of the greatest criminal lawyers this country has known, a reputable magazine editor, a well-known radio commentator, the youngest Lieutenant Governor in the history of the great State of Illinois, and as the only veteran of the Spanish-American War now serving in Congress. He is also a veteran of World War I.

As Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and as the presiding officer of the State senate, he commenced an investigation into the wages paid to working women. This pioneer work in the field of women's rights resulted in giving the whole minimum wage movement its impetus. The administration, in which he played a major role, established the first public utilities commission in Illinois.

BARRATT O'HARA entered his career in the Congress of the United States at an age when most men think only of retirement, at a youthful age of 66. He has since then given to the Nation invaluable service as a legislator totally committed to the public good.

As a Representative from the 50th State, I feel deeply indebted to BARRATT

O'HARA for his eloquent and moving pleas which he made in support of Hawaiian statehood. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin singled out his speech delivered on this floor in 1950 as the most effective made in behalf of Hawaiian statehood in the 81st Congress and printed it in three installments. He eloquently stated at that time:

The pattern of the Old World of the horse and buggy should be modernized even in the matter of selecting territories to be taken into the Union of the States. My faith is in my country and the purity of its purpose to ask nothing for its own people that it does not seek to make possible for all men to attain in a world of brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, BARRATT O'HARA on his 83d birthday abounds in spirit and imagination which the young in age can well emulate, as we struggle for the attainment of the Great Society.

As one who has enjoyed a close personal friendship with BARRATT O'HARA, I fervently hope that he will continue to serve his country and his constituency in Congress until he is 100—as he has vowed to do. God knows the world needs men of BARRATT O'HARA's caliber, integrity, understanding, and foresight.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy that our colleague from Hawaii has taken this time to pay tribute to one of the finest, noblest men I have ever known. I associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Hawaii. BARRATT O'HARA's careers have been as distinguished as they have been varied. I doubt that there is a single other person in public life in America today who has seen life from so many angles and who has appreciated its challenges as much as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

One of the most articulate men I have ever known, one of the most courageous men, one of the sweetest characters on earth, BARRATT O'HARA—may he live long and may his ideals continue to prosper.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the majority leader.

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to associate myself with the deserved tribute which has been paid to this noble colleague of ours, Mr. BARRATT O'HARA, from Illinois. His eloquence, his nobility of spirit, his lofty idealism constitute an example and an inspiration not only for his colleagues but also for his countrymen. May his days continue to be long and fruitful in this Chamber and upon the earth.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida. I cannot express them as well or as eloquently as he, but I join him in paying tribute to my great leader, the great BARRATT O'HARA.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, welcome the opportunity to join in this expression of love and admiration for the great colleague from Illinois whose eloquence continually stirs this legislative body.

I believe if there could appropriately be given a name to this outstanding Member of the House, it would be "the happy warrior of the Congress of the United States."

Congressman O'HARA is a great legislator, a great humanitarian, a great speaker, and a great individual. It is a continuing source of pleasure and inspiration to serve with him in this body.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Florida. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who has served on the committee with Congressman O'HARA, I want all Members to know and the Record to include that no one makes a finer contribution to the committee and no one engenders a more humane spirit in the legislation which emanates from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs than BARRATT O'HARA. BARRATT O'HARA served in the great 80th Division during World War I. Its motto was "The 80th Only Moves Forward." One of the reasons it always did was BARRATT O'HARA. BARRATT has always moved forward for his fellow man and still does. I hope he continues to do so for many years to come.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made. The thing which has always impressed me most about Mr. O'HARA is his youthful spirit and his youthful outlook. I know how many years he claims, but I also know he is not a man who looks back. He always looks forward. I think some "young fogies" could well benefit from this youthful, effervescent spirit. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join our colleagues in this well deserved tribute so deeply felt by all of our Members for our colleague, BARRATT O'HARA. His alert, inquisitive mind and his high-spirited idealism mark him as a young man. BARRATT O'HARA will always be a young man.

As one Member of this House, I shall treasure always the opportunities I have enjoyed to visit with BARRATT O'HARA on numerous occasions. I feel myself richer for having been exposed to his wealthy store of knowledge and his magnificently charitable spirit.

His mind and his heart are big. His vision is broad. And his friendship is truly a thing to treasure.

April 28, 1965

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in extending my greeting to the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, on his birthday. I think one of the finest things that can be said about a man is that he is a good man. In my book BARRATT O'HARA is a good man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish him many, many decades of good health, happiness, and success so that in the golden years of life he may harvest the rich dividends and spiritual satisfaction which he has so ably earned in a lifetime of dedicated service to his State and his country.

MR. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and the other Members here who have paid well deserved tribute to the gentleman from Illinois, my distinguished and indomitable colleague [Mr. O'HARA]. His ready wit and perceptive comment have added much to our deliberations and I am grateful to him for his constructive contributions to this body.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from Hawaii and very simply say to my good friend and distinguished colleague BARRATT O'HARA that I greatly value his friendship. He is a man of principle, conviction, and courage. He has ennobled this House by his courage and his actions.

I might say he has always been a stanch friend of Israel, the only democracy in the Near East. His support of that country has meant much to the course of freedom in the Near East.

I would merely add, BARRATT, I hope that you not only prosper in your important work in this House for many years but in congratulating you on your birthday, may I wish that you live to be 120 years young.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding to me. I wish to join in paying tribute to BARRATT O'HARA today. He and I belong to a rather exclusive club, I think, perhaps with one or two other Members, not the Spanish-American War veterans but, rather, the former Lieutenant governors of our respective States, which we were at almost the same time. Of course, BARRATT and I are about the same age, give or take 20 or 30 years. However, for a time when he first came to Congress—and I think I should say this for the benefit of the

other Members of the House in case there is any question in your mind as to his ability—I managed him. When I say I managed him I mean I was in charge of booking all of the various prizefights and fisticuffs in which he engaged. He was known in the prize ring and up and down the eastern seaboard as "KID" O'HARA. He packed a very great wallop and we had a lot of fun out of it. "KID," I hope you continue in good shape and in good condition and that you do your roadwork regularly and keep your legs sound and hold your left out in front of you a little bit and watch out for those right uppercuts. I think you will finish the course all right. Congratulations.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join the many Members of Congress who would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, on his 83d birthday. I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to pay tribute to him may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. In addition to what my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, has stated as to being a member of the exclusive club of former Lieutenant Governors, I want to point out that BARRATT O'HARA was elected Lieutenant Governor of Illinois in 1912. A great number of Members do not know that he was the first public official in the Nation to expose the slave labor conditions in the child labor sweatshops.

Lt. Gov. BARRATT O'HARA pioneered the first public hearings that exposed to the Nation the fact that children were working in those days at starvation wages in the sweatshops of the city of Chicago and also throughout the Nation. He was the pioneer public official who sponsored legislation that did away with the sweatshops in that early day.

He not only accomplished a great deal as Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, but he was also one of the great lawyers of the Middle West and was associated for a number of years with Clarence Darrow in the practice of law.

He also was nationally known as a newspaperman and his writings were published by newspapers and magazines throughout the Nation before and during World War I.

Mr. Speaker, he is the only Spanish-American War veteran in the Congress of the United States. We all hope that BARRATT O'HARA will be a Member of this body for many, many years to come and we congratulate him on his 83d birthday today.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. We, from Missouri, are proud to offer the gentleman from Illinois, BARRATT O'HARA, as an example of the benefits to be derived from attend-

ing Missouri University. He was not only a great fighter, but he was the best football player pound for pound that attended that school. We commend his career to everyone.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Illinois is known as the Land of Lincoln and, in this day, it has given other great men to our Nation and to public service.

I refer to two gentlemen whom I have the good fortune to have as my friends and colleagues, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON and the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA. Both of these Representatives serve their country well and both of them have celebrated their birthdays this week.

I join my colleagues in wishing them the best of health, happiness, and all good fortunes for many years to come.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of this body, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, on the occasion of his 83d birthday.

We in the House are fortunate indeed to have among us a man whose outstanding career is certain to merit him a place in American history. There are few indeed who are privileged to have had so much adventure and to have given so much service to their fellow men in one lifetime as BARRATT O'HARA.

Youthful explorer, Spanish American War and World War I soldier, newspapermen, youngest attorney general in Illinois' history, motion picture executive, brilliant defense lawyer, author, and Congressman—each of these careers and achievements would require a lifetime of an ordinary man. BARRATT O'HARA has accomplished them in 83 short years.

It is a measure of the stature of this outstanding American that he first came to Congress at an age when most men have retired. Since his election from the Second District of Illinois to the 81st Congress, he has earned the respect of his colleagues for the depth of his wisdom and the breadth of his vision.

It has been my distinct privilege to have served with Mr. O'HARA on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He has never ceased to amaze me with his energy and abilities. His counsel and advice to me have been of inestimable value through the years.

Today in congratulating BARRATT O'HARA on his birthday, I want to add my sincere best wishes to him for many more years of fruitful service to his constituents and to our Nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8411

undertaken, especially aimed at employing the unskilled and the semiskilled.

A month later, in an address to the City Council of New York, I proposed that New York City launch a broadscale attack on hardcore poverty in our city—to be aimed at the roots of the problem and its contributory factors.

Immediately some critics asked us to define precisely the poverty we were going to attack. During the ensuing discussion, I felt like saying what Humpty Dumpty said in "Alice in Wonderland":

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

I think most of us know today what we mean by poverty. The figure used nationally—which we found to fit New York City, too—is one out of every five. In New York City about 1,800,000 individuals, belonging to 389,000 families, live in conditions approximating poverty. Of course, the dictionary definition of poverty—"having little or nothing in the way of wealth, goods, or subsistence" has little practical application to America in 1965. Most of the poor today have some goods, and almost all have or receive some subsistence.

But really, when we speak of the poor, we know whom we are talking about. But the entire range of the poor are hard to define precisely. They range from completely normal and law-abiding New Yorkers to some who have what the experts call a deep social pathology—with a sense of total alienation from existing social institutions as well as from the positive elements in their own communities and neighborhoods.

Most of this latter group have no respect for law and order. They include the drug addicts, the addict pushers, the numbers runners, the petty thieves, the muggers, and others who form a special underworld of the poor—which preys primarily upon the poor.

It is this underworld whose members constitute our greatest single social liability who are the greatest menace to their own communities as well as a source of endless social cost to society as a whole. These elements were responsible for most of the evidence and perpetrated most of the looting in last summer's convulsive riots. This subgroup gives a bad name to Negroes and to Puerto Ricans. It is our city's worst blight.

This is not the true underworld. The underworld I am now defining belongs to the poor. Its denizens come from the poor. They are poor.

It is not generally known, but these criminal poor prey most of all on other poor. The law-abiding poor are the easiest victims. They have the least security for what they own. Their property is the most accessible, and also the most disposable and the least traceable.

This victimization of the poor is one of the main indignities of poverty. Most of the poor think that they get less police protection than others do. In New York City, at least, this is not deliberately so, but it probably works out this way because of the greater difficulty of policing poor neighborhoods.

I dwell on this subject because it often goes unnoticed by those concerned with the problem of poverty. Yet it is a major aspect of the rising crime rate in our cities.

The underworld of poverty, while only a tiny part of the poverty population, plays a major part in the world of the poor, as an ever-present menace and symbol of the degradation of poverty. This underworld must be an object of our special attention in the war on poverty. None of our present programs confront it. It must be confronted.

The basic challenge is to give all the poor the opportunity and the wherewithal to better their economic condition. They must

also be given the hope and the desire to do so.

New York City and the Nation have accepted the challenge. The question is: How are we meeting it? What is our plan?

Our plan consists of many parts, in order to meet the many-faceted problem. We intend to do a great many different things, designed to meet the needs of different groups, as well as different factors in the causation of poverty.

Unfortunately, thus far, we have been able to start only a few of the things we must do. We have begun to work on the special programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, and the activities that fall under the community action plan provided under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

All these programs are now in the beginning stages of implementation. In New York City our expectation for 1965 is to involve approximately 25,000 people—mostly youth—as direct beneficiaries and participants in the various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Preschool training programs will be provided for approximately 7,000 children from disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Special loans and other aids are to be made to small businesses to enable qualified individuals from these disadvantaged neighborhoods to start and to conduct businesses of their own.

For the aged, there will be basic services including employment opportunities.

Most of these sample programs I have just mentioned will be operated and conducted from the disadvantaged neighborhoods. Except for the professional experts required for training, counseling, and administration, all the personnel required for these programs will be solicited from the neighborhoods.

I want to refer here to the two trailblazing, neighborhood-based poverty programs in New York City which have served as prototypes for others throughout the country: Haryou-Act in Central Harlem, and mobilization-for-youth on the Lower East Side.

Although these programs were originally designed to combat juvenile delinquency, experience soon dictated that their scope should be enlarged to include a broad-scale attack upon the conditions underlying poverty.

Much has been learned from these two pioneer undertakings. We, in New York City, are trying to apply what has been learned. Meanwhile, we will continue to support mobilization-for-youth and Haryou-Act with New York City funds. The mobilization-for-youth program is, of course, of special interest in Puerto Rico because one of the major population components in the 67-block area covered by mobilization-for-youth is Puerto Rican.

Now, I want to turn to the special Puerto Rican aspects of our antipoverty program.

You might be interested in a few facts and figures about the Puerto Ricans in New York. Puerto Ricans born in New York get more education than those born in Puerto Rico who come to New York. The average is 2 years more education for Puerto Rican men and 3 years more for women. Nevertheless, compared to the rest of the population, Puerto Ricans are still at a disadvantage. According to the 1960 census, Puerto Ricans 25 years old and older averaged 3 years less education than the comparable figure for the total population of New York City.

Almost 30 percent of Puerto Ricans 25 years old or older had less than 5 years of education, compared to only 9 percent for the entire population of the city. In the same age group, only 10 percent of Puerto

Ricans had completed high school, and only 3 percent had gone on to college, compared to 24 and 18 percent for the total population.

The unemployment rate for Puerto Ricans is double that of the city average.

In 1960, 33 percent of all Puerto Rican families in New York City had incomes of less than \$3,000, compared with 13 percent of all families in New York City.

Only 3 percent of Puerto Rican families had incomes of \$10,000 or more, in contrast to 22 percent for all New York City families.

Even these statistics have their bright side. The fact is that more than 5,000 Puerto Ricans have jobs with the city government.

More than 100 auxiliary teachers, who are completely bilingual, are working for the board of education. Almost all of them are graduates of the University of Puerto Rico.

More than 6,000 Puerto Ricans own their own businesses.

These are just sample figures which help in drawing a profile.

All the programs to which I have already referred are aimed at expanding the horizons of opportunity and lowering the barriers of discrimination for the benefit of New York City's Puerto Ricans, as well as for Negroes and other disadvantaged groups. In the preschool training program, special emphasis will be given to the language barrier. Bilingual teachers will be employed.

Puerto Ricans from among the ranks of the poor will be trained in subprofessional capacities for service to the poor—as assistants to visiting doctors and nurses, as attendants in hospitals and nursing homes, as itinerant helpers in the households of the aged, as maintenance personnel for apartment houses.

This kind of training can and will be provided in neighborhood centers for the unskilled, untrained, and unlettered.

We plan to mobilize Puerto Rican professionals—or at least Spanish-speaking professionals—to train these subprofessionals.

It is our belief that one of the expanding areas of employment opportunities for the future is in providing increased services to the sick, the disabled, the young, the aged—indeed, to all who need the kind of help which must be furnished by human hands and cannot be automated.

Late last summer a group of Puerto Ricans, acting through an organization called the Puerto Rican Forum, asked me to arrange a financial grant from the city government to enable them to plan a comprehensive anti-poverty program based on the special needs of Puerto Ricans in New York. I approved a \$70,000 allocation for this purpose. Additional funds have since been granted. Recently, the Puerto Rican Forum submitted a comprehensive multimillion-dollar program. The proposals of the Puerto Rican Forum, which are complex, are under active study and consideration. Other Puerto Rican groups in New York have submitted alternative proposals. From all these proposals, a program will be worked out which can be fitted into the overall framework of the city's anti-poverty plan and provide an adequate reflection of special Puerto Rican needs.

One of the ideas proposed by the Puerto Rican Forum especially intrigued me. It was proposed to subsidize the maintenance and spread of Puerto Rican culture in New York City through a network of existing Puerto Rican organizations. This is linked up with the war against poverty. Actually, it would be difficult to allocate governmental funds for this purpose. However, we are still studying this approach, and are trying to find a way to get fiscal support for a part of this undertaking.

In any event, I want to tell you that I am determined, as mayor, to insure that the

Puerto Ricans of New York receive a full share of the benefits of the poverty program—the share to which they are entitled by virtue of their numbers and by virtue of their need.

The full scope of the powers, authority, and resources of every department of the city government is to be focused on the achievement of this objective.

I would like to underline this point, because I believe that the uniqueness of New York City's poverty program lies in the fact that the entire range of city government resources has been placed, by executive order, within the orbit of the poverty program. To head up the poverty program, I selected one of the highest ranking officials of the City of New York, the president of the city council, Mr. Paul Screvane, who is also one of the most accomplished administrators to come up through the ranks of the city government in my memory.

My purpose was to give the poverty program a top priority among all the programs of the city government. In a real sense, the entire city government is engaged in the poverty program, and deeply committed to it.

I consider each Puerto Rican in New York a New Yorker like other New Yorkers—a New Yorker equal in all respects, in his rights and his claims for privilege and opportunity.

We certainly welcome the Commonwealth and its office in New York as the interpreter, advocate, friend, and defender of the Puerto Ricans in New York. There are, in fact, many individuals and organizations claiming to be the spokesmen of all Puerto Ricans in New York. That is natural. I honor and recognize them all for their efforts. However, I want recognition, too, as one who speaks and works for the interests of the 700,000 Puerto Ricans in the 5 boroughs of New York City.

In this connection, I want to pay tribute to the activities of the Commonwealth in New York City, particularly through its migration division. I want to express my appreciation to Labor Secretary Frank Zorilla, under whom the migration division operates. Secretary Zorilla deserves praise for his supervision of this fine activity. And of course, I want to mention the director of that division, a true friend, although he frequently presses us hard, Joe Monserrat. I was very happy to approve recently the appointment of one of the key employees of the migration division, brilliant young Joe Morales, to one of the top positions on the staff of the anti-poverty operations board.

If I were to summarize the prescription to meet the needs of the war against poverty, it would be a prescription for most of the things that are being done today. But I would prescribe a much bigger scale, with a much broader sweep. And there are many additional programs which cry to be launched.

Emergency actions are needed now to forestall emergency situations later.

We need that public works program I proposed 15 months ago. We need it now more than ever. Of course, the cost would be very great, and the cost of stepping up all the other programs I have been talking about would be very great, too.

Yet the money must be found, as it certainly would be found if we faced a military emergency abroad.

There must be substantially greater Federal grants directly to the localities for education, for training, for housing, for all the programs I have been talking about and that have been discussed at this conference. But the local and State governments must be ready to strain their resources, too. This means more taxes, which is not easy to contemplate and even less to institute. But it must be done. The people must be convinced that it must be done.

Will the sum of all the programs I have discussed cure poverty? Frankly, I don't know. Neither does anybody. I know one thing: we must try everything. We cannot afford to stop.

There are lions in the streets, angry lions, aggrieved lions, lions who had been caged until the cages crumbled. We had better do something about those lions, and when I speak of lions I do not mean individuals. I mean the spirit of the people, those who have been neglected and oppressed, and discriminated against, and misunderstood and forgotten. Some of them now have the spirits of angry lions. We must promptly set about to remedy the conditions which brought them into being. And we have no time. The time is now. It is already after midnight on the clock of history. We can only pray that the clock will stop awhile and give us the breathing space to work our wills in accordance with our consciences, to the best of our abilities.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend President Johnson for his course of action in Vietnam and to express my appreciation for his frank and open statement to the American people and to the peoples of the world in explanation of U.S. policy in that area.

Public opinion polls have shown that a vast majority of the American people support the President's policy in Vietnam. After his press conference yesterday, that support should increase, both here and abroad. The President emphasized again that we have learned the lessons afforded by the appeasement of Munich. He could not have been more right when he said that failure to resist in Vietnam would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression, encourage those who seek to conquer other nations in their reach, and endanger American welfare and freedom.

I am also proud of the restraint being exercised by our President in his determination to provide the maximum amount of deterrent with the minimum cost. The carefully controlled bombings which the President has authorized are coupled with his desire to stop the loss of lives and end the conflict. I was pleased to read his words:

I do sometimes wonder how some people can be so concerned with our bombing a cold bridge of steel and concrete in North Vietnam but never open their mouth about a bomb being placed in our Embassy in South Vietnam.

President Johnson repeated that our bombings of their bridges, radar stations, and ammunition will cease the moment the North Vietnamese end their aggression. In renewing his offer for unconditional discussions and reemphasizing the firmness of our position, the President not only deserves the fullest support of every American, but that of freedom-loving people everywhere.

TIME FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that various other Members be permitted to extend their remarks in today's RECORD at the end of my remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon this same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, present developments in various parts of the world, particularly in Vietnam, make the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations a definite necessity. Let us not forget that the captive people of North Vietnam also have a stake in the outcome of the current crisis there. Despite the eased tensions in Eastern Europe, let us not forget that the various totalitarian Red governments do not represent the underlying captive nations and in a variety of ways continue to oppress and exploit the captive peoples. Let us also not forget that Moscow's deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence cannot conceal the realities of Soviet Russian imperialism in the captive non-Russian countries of the empire-state called the Soviet Union. And let us not forget that the captive nation of Cuba is still off our shores and is being systematically exploited by Moscow and Peiping alike for Red totalitarian penetration of Latin America.

In short, Mr. Speaker, as our interest and energies are being absorbed by certain particular events, let us not forget the general and basic state of the captive nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America. And the best way in not forgetting them at this time is to create now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This is the time for such a committee.

A BRIDGE TO TRUE UNDERSTANDING

As Representatives of the American people, we have now a wonderful opportunity to construct a bridge of true understanding between ourselves and the neglected captive nations and peoples. Diplomatic bridges with totalitarian governments in the Red empire are not necessarily bridges with the underlying captive nations. We need more than one type of bridge for the terrain is substantially different between the oppressor and the oppressed, the colonialist and the colonial, the exploiter and the exploited. A Special Committee on the Captive Nations in this Congress would be our bridge of true understanding of, and abiding faith in, the close to 1 billion captive people.

It has been my privilege to introduce the original resolution proposing this bridge of true understanding. Dozen-

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8443

Although the buildings and health departments list some of the violations as hazardous to the lives and health of the men, women, and children who live in the buildings concerned, the landlords do not consider themselves criminals.

What is more important, however, is that the courts and the judges themselves do not consider them criminals, nor their acts more serious than many parking violations.

Despite the fact that the penalty for conviction for a housing misdemeanor can run as high as a \$500 fine and 30 days in jail, it rarely does. In fact, many violators continue to find it far less expensive to pay their fines than to fix their houses.

In 1964 there were a total of 20,613 convictions in housing court and of these, 19,718 were fined a total of \$332,498—an average of \$16.86 per case. In January of this year, 957 cases were reported as convictions and 692 persons were fined \$17,220, an average of \$10.90 per case.

To put the court's attitude toward housing violations and the slumlords into proper perspective, one need look no further than traffic court, where the standard fine for parking a car in a restricted area is \$15.

Even the amount of the fines in housing court is not an accurate barometer for measuring the punishment of housing violators. The average fine per case does not take into consideration the total number of violations per case.

In many instances, the fine averages out to no more than \$4 a violation. For this reason, it is not difficult to see why many landlords find it far more economical to pay a small fine rather than have the violation fixed before the matter falls into the jurisdiction of the housing court. In some cases, landlords even save money by paying the fine.

For instance, yesterday one of the landlords convicted for failure to provide heat for 2 days to his 60-family apartment house in Manhattan was fined \$25.

After paying his fine he told a reporter that the boiler was broken for the 2 days, but that during that time he saved almost 5,000 gallons of fuel, at 6 cents a gallon—\$300.

Despite the high percentage of convictions—more than 90 percent—the criminal prosecution of housing code violators does not function as a deterrent to continued abuse. Landlords plead guilty to violations, but then appear at another time to make the plea to other charges.

The procedures of the court do not usually help the tenant who must endure the violation while the court action is taken.

At present there are often delays of as long as 3 months between the time an inspector makes a recommendation for court action and the first appearance of the violator in court. The matter does not usually end there, because in many cases there are continued adjournments and it may be a year before the case is finally settled.

For many landlords, housing court has taken on the flavor of traffic court, where, despite a person's feeling that he is not guilty, he will often plead guilty and pay a fine. If he were to plead not guilty, he would then have to appear on another day for trial, and even then he could not be sure the city would be ready with its case. If his time is more valuable, he pleads guilty and is finished with it.

However, the "operators"—landlords who buy and sell slum buildings for profit, and who milk them for every penny they can get out of them—will often "shop around" for a more lenient judge and will plead not guilty on a day when a strict judge is on the bench. On the day for trial, before the lenient judge, they will change their plea to guilty and accept the low fine imposed.

The "operators" also manage to avoid having their names sullied with convictions by having the name of a corporation substituted on the court records.

Another factor that works against the administration of justice in housing cases is that in the cases of flagrant violators, it is often difficult to find out who is the legal owner of the building.

Although "managing agents" usually collect the rent, when it comes time to appear in court for a series of violations they are frequently "fired" and no longer work for the owner.

The department issuing the summons for the violation must then try to find the true owner of the property. This is often more difficult than it may seem. The person who is held legally responsible for the building often maintains that he is still not the owner.

In these cases, the true owner hides behind a facade of corporation names and post office box numbers, or uses a telephone answering service so that he can screen his calls. In this way he "cannot be contacted" for the service of summonses or for complaints to be registered with him.

A typical day in housing court begins with the crowded corridor and the usual press of bodies trying to get into the courtroom.

Yesterday there were 44 cases on the docket and the courtroom was half empty. The court clerk—the "Bridgeman"—called off the name of a defendant, who would approach the bench. The clerk would ask if he was acquainted with the charges, rattle off the defendant's rights and then ask for a plea.

It was a bad day for the defendants.

In 20 cases, they pleaded guilty and were fined an average of \$32 a case. One defendant paid \$110 for four cases involving a total of 18 violations—or an average of \$6 per violation.

Another landlord paid a \$50 fine for a violation consisting of a faulty elevator.

Another claimed his tenant refused to allow his apartment to be painted and that an inspector issued a summons anyway. He received a \$10 suspended sentence.

Of the rest of the cases, 20 were adjourned for trial. In the four others, warrants were issued for the defendants' arrest for failure to appear in court.

When the name of the landlord for 286 Fort Washington Avenue was called, 16 people rose and approached the bench. They were the landlord, his attorney, and 14 tenants from the building.

After pleading guilty, without an explanation, the landlord, W. Genuth, of 273 Havemeyer Street, Brooklyn, was fined \$25 for failure to provide heat in the 60-apartment building. As the judge pronounced sentence, the tenants walked out quickly—obviously not satisfied.

Outside the courtroom they got into an argument with Mr. Genuth because they claimed that he had harassed them.

John Churko, a spokesman for the tenants, claimed that for the last 4 years they have had trouble with him. He said that the landlord had continually refused to make repairs or to paint the apartments. He said that for a period of 7 weeks early this year, the tenants had to walk to their apartments in the six-story building because the elevator was not working.

Mr. Genuth denied the charges of harassment but admitted that the elevator was not working for that length of time.

"Vandals broke the control panel on the elevator," he said, "and it took 7 weeks to the day to have it repaired. It cost me more than \$7,000, but they don't want to listen to me."

As for the no-heat violation, Mr. Genuth agreed that the building was without heat

for 2 days but said someone had broken the boiler. He showed a bill for \$900 for repairs to the boiler, and for rusted bolts that allowed the water to seep out.

He blamed labor troubles for the "vandals" who had destroyed his property.

"It cost me more than \$12,000 for all the work on the building so far this year," he said. "I try but I just can't keep up with it all. I have tenants in the building who are paying \$65 a month for six rooms under rent control. They should have rent controls but they should make it like \$25 a room instead of about \$19. For me it's an investment, but I can't make money on this."

A half hour later, at 12:20, another day in housing court had drawn to a close. Judge Maurice Downing, graying and reserved, refused to talk with a reporter and left immediately.

Long criticized by civic groups for many reasons, the housing court and its judge remain unchanged.

Not too long ago, a city official, who is deeply concerned about the dual failure of the housing code and the housing court to bring about a solution to the problem of slumlords, brought up the topic with a criminal court judge, who sits on housing court.

According to the city official, the Judge maintained that he just didn't feel that most housing violations were true criminal acts. According to this judge, most housing problems should be settled by the tenants and the landlords, not by the criminal courts.

As long as judges feel this way—and more than one certainly does—the housing court will continue to offer little relief to the thousands of New Yorkers being victimized daily by landlords who operate freely as slumlords within the framework of the law.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LIII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article on New York City's slumlords appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 10, 1965.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY ARMED WITH POPGUNS IN ITS WAR ON SLUMLORDS

(NOTE.—In the greatest city in the world, perhaps the basic ill is slum housing. As part of the Herald Tribune's continuing investigative series, "New York City in Crisis," Reporters Martin J. Steadman and Alfonso Narvaez have spent 1 month intensively examining the problems of the slumlords and the dwellers. Today, in the fourth article, the Tribune offers possible—and vitally necessary—solutions.)

(By Martin J. Steadman, of the Herald Tribune staff)

The New York City Buildings Department is fighting the growing slum problem with one hand tied behind its back.

A month-long Herald Tribune investigation found that loopholes in the law, lenient judges, and an unmanned buildings department let hard-core slumlords milk old-law tenements at the expense of the tenants.

Here are some of the problems the buildings department faces:

No legal staff. Cases against slumlords are prepared by clerks.

8444

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 28, 1965

Delays of as long as 3 months from the time court action is recommended and the scheduled court appearance of the defendant.

Penalties imposed on landlords by judges in housing court are extremely lenient. Rarely does a slumlord go to jail. The average fine last year was \$16.86, far less than what it would cost a landlord to make the repairs demanded by the buildings department.

Only eight process servers are available to try to track down the hard-core slumlords. The buildings department is forced to resort to service of summons by mail, a dubious legal maneuver. Result: There are now 1,500 cases pending where the landlord has not appeared in court following mailed service of the summons. The backlog of cases is growing.

The department tried to hire a private process service agency last year, paying first \$1.50, then \$2.50, per summons. But the agency found it unprofitable and notified the city that it would not do the job any longer.

The buildings department does not have statutory power to subpoena witnesses, take testimony under oath, and compel the production of books and records of slumlords. Each year since 1960, a bill has been introduced in the legislature to give the department these powers. Each year the bill has died in committee.

The receivership program, which allows the city to seize a slum tenement, fix it up and collect rents until the job is paid for, is just limping along. To date, only 74 buildings have gone into receivership. The buildings department considers receivership a potent weapon in code enforcement. The mere threat of seizure has brought compliance by reluctant landlords in 154 buildings. But the staff for this highly touted program numbers only 17 people, with just 1 attorney, borrowed from another department. The entire receivership staff boasts three clerks, two typists, a stenographer, eight inspectors, and two process servers.

Overlapping jurisdiction. Lack-of-heat violations come under the jurisdiction of the health department. Lack-of-hot-water violations come under the jurisdiction of buildings. Usually both violations are traceable to a defective boiler. Though civic groups have clamored for consolidation of housing enforcement agencies for years, New York City still clings to the old way of doing things.

The shortcomings in budget and staff of the buildings department were recently pointed up by the Community Service Society, a quietly effective nonprofit civic group which keeps a close watch on housing problems. The agency wrote:

"No substantial improvement in code enforcement can be expected until the Department of Buildings receives a budget commensurate with its responsibilities."

CSS also took the occasion to criticize the courts. "Until fines are greater than the cost of repairs, it is not likely that this method of enforcement will be as effective as it should be."

The buildings department has been shaken by scandals many times over the years. Inspectors have been dismissed and jailed over taking graft. After the last grand jury report, in 1959, Mayor Wagner reached out for a cop to head the department. He got Harold Birns, a former assistant district attorney in Frank Hogan's rackets squad.

Since then the buildings department has been functioning in relative quiet. Commissioner Birns has fired 30 inspectors summarily, but no major scandal, or charges of organized graft collecting have disturbed his administration. As for enforcement of the housing code by the buildings department, statistics indicate it is doing a greater amount of enforcement each year.

Inspectors reported 425,526 housing violations on 30,562 buildings in 1964. The pre-

vious record high, in 1963, was 307,715. That figure was considerably higher than the 195-585 violations reported in 1962.

Most of the increased inspection activity was caused by the "cycle survey," a cellar-to-roof inspection of every building in a slum neighborhood, instituted July 15, 1963. The cycle survey teams do not wait for tenant complaints.

To date, cycle survey teams have visited 30,105 buildings, containing 157,209 apartments. When the program began, 40,208 violations were pending on those buildings. The inspectors handed out an additional 227,925 violations.

All this inspection activity shows up in housing court, of course. There were 22,441 cases brought by the buildings department in 1964, up from the 16,086 in 1963. More than 90 percent of the cases end in convictions, and last year 20,613 landlords paid \$332,498 in fines.

The last figure is disturbing to civic groups as well as law enforcement officials. The average fine in 1960 was \$26.67. Each year since, it has declined, until last year the landlords were walking out of housing court with average fines of less than \$17.

In 1964, only 10 landlords went to jail. In 1963, only seven jail terms were handed down.

But many observers feel that even with the increased activity, the buildings department is losing the fight against spreading slums.

City Councilman J. Raymond Jones, speaking at a budget hearing last December, remarked: "We give the buildings department a teacup and expect it to stop the Hudson from flowing into the bay."

The buildings department budget for this fiscal year is \$10.2 million. Commissioner Birns is asking \$15 million for next year.

Almost the entire buildings department budget goes for the salaries of 1,642 employees, including 866 building and housing inspectors. The payroll amounts to \$9.9 million of the \$10.2 million budget.

The budget for the executive staff of the buildings department has always been rather niggardly compared to the plush budgets for other city departments.

There are only 20 lines in the budget, including the commissioner and two deputies, for the administration of a central office and five borough offices. Two of the lines are unfilled, which means two of the officials are doubling in their jobs. There is no public relations officer attached to the buildings department, perhaps the only major city department without one.

There are 48,000 old-law tenements on the city streets. Built before the turn of the century, many of these buildings would have been ordered boarded up long ago if there weren't a housing shortage in the city.

The vacancy ratio at present—the key figure in determining just how much leeway the city has in getting tough with landlords who do not comply with the law—is now at a very low 1.7 percent. In effect, this means that even if the city wanted to vacate a bad building, vacancy ratio figures insist that officials must go slow—there is no place to move the ousted tenants.

The vacate order is the ultimate weapon against the slumlord. His tenants are ordered out and the premises boarded up. But because there is no place to put the tenants, the buildings department could close only 27 old-law tenements in 1962, 34 in 1963, and 51 in 1964. In the 4 years between 1934 and 1937, the city boarded up over 2,000 slum buildings, an average of over 500 a year.

But it was easier for Mayor La Guardia, brandishing a hatchet or a flit gun, to order a slum building boarded up immediately. The vacancy ratio in the 1930's ran well up to between 12 and 17 percent. Adding to the enormity of the problem faced by Mayor Wagner and his building department is the

simple fact that these tenements are now 30 years older than when Mr. La Guardia was crusading against them.

Last May, the city commissioned a study of the present housing code by the Columbia University Legislative Drafting Research Fund. Headed by Prof. Frank Grad, the study team is expected to take 3 years, at a cost of \$255,000, to analyze the deficiencies in the present code, and return recommendations.

Professor Grad said yesterday that he filed a preliminary report on consolidation of housing enforcement agencies several months ago, but the city has not yet released his recommendations.

The professor declined to discuss his findings, but it was learned that he urged consolidation as a long-overdue measure.

Reforms in the tenements come in fits and starts. In 1901, the legislature passed the sweeping tenement house law, outlawing any more construction of the dingy, unsafe buildings. Toilets were moved into the houses from the backyards.

In 1929, the legislature mandated fire-retarding of cellars and halls, and in 1955, the multiple dwelling code was amended to require central heating in every apartment house.

This could be the year for greater tenement-house reform—perhaps a tightened multiple dwelling law and city housing code. If the people and their elected officers want it.

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Vietnam is one of such critical character that I am sure we all are glad to see outstanding and dedicated Americans earnestly thinking about the problem and offering their ideas as to what would contribute toward the solution of the problem in a way consistent with the interest of freedom of the people of Vietnam. I submit for the Appendix for the consideration of my colleagues and fellow countrymen suggestions which I believe to be worthy of note which have been made upon the subject by Mr. John Bethea, an instructor in the Department of Social Science at the University of Miami, and together with the proposal of Mr. Bethea, an article by Mr. Clarke Ash, associate editor of the Miami News, commanding the plan which Mr. Bethea proposes.

[The material referred to appears in the Appendix.]

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8445

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SCHUEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I submit for the reading of my colleagues an address by the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Santiago Polanco-Abreu, and the well deserved introduction by Mr. Roy Vallance, president of the Inter-American Bar Association, delivered before Inter-American Bar Association and the District of Columbia Bar Committee on Inter-American Relations, at the National Lawyer Clubs of Washington, D.C., on April 27, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction and address of our colleague are as follows:

SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

Born October 30, 1920, in Bayamón, P.R. Attended elementary and high school in Isabela, P.R. Bachelor of arts and LL.B., University of Puerto Rico, 1943. President of the student council. Popular Democrat. Practiced law in Isabela and San Juan. Appointed legal adviser to the tax court of Puerto Rico, August 1943. Married Viola Orsini, 1944; no children. Elected to the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1948, 1952, 1956, 1960. Member of the constitutional convention of Puerto Rico, 1951-52. Chairman, committee on finance; vice chairman, committees on interior government, appointments, and impeachment proceedings, and member of the committee of rules and calendar. Appointed speaker of the house, January 17, 1963. Member of the American Bar Association, Bar Association of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rican Atheneum, Association of American Writers, Lions' Club, and Pan-American Gun Club. Advocates economic and social change in Latin America and in this respect believes Puerto Rico has a fundamental role to fulfill. Has traveled in Europe, North America, and in most Latin American Republics. Elected November 3, 1964, for a 4-year term as Resident Commissioner.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO
(Address by Santiago Polanco-Abreu, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico)

I am greatly honored by the invitation of the Inter-American Bar Association and the D.C. Bar Committee on Inter-American Relations to join with them here today to speak on the economic development of Puerto Rico. It is extremely rewarding to me that this distinguished group is interested in the problems of Puerto Rico and how we are handling them. And, with your permission, I would like to look at the Commonwealth against the larger backdrop of the two-thirds of the world which lives in deep poverty.

Certainly all of us are perturbed by the enormous gulf which separates the "have" from the "have not" nations, and even more perturbed by the fact that this gulf seems to be growing, rather than diminishing.

Happily, there have been some noteworthy exceptions to this trend of the rich getting richer, while the poor get poorer or barely hold their own. The rates of economic growth in Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico, for example, are now much higher than the growth rates of more highly developed countries. In contrast with most underdeveloped countries, moreover, their growth has been nothing short of spectacular. Today, Japan, Israel, and Puerto Rico are on the other side

of the fence, sending their technicians and providing technical assistance to their less fortunate neighbors.

Recognizing that Puerto Rico is no more a typical case than Japan or Israel, it is nevertheless worthwhile, I believe, to understand something of its economic development history in order to see more clearly some of the problems characteristic of underdeveloped countries and some of the solutions that have proved workable in Puerto Rico.

In 1898, when Puerto Rico was ceded by Spain to the United States, the island was indeed underdeveloped. Most people lived in poverty on small subsistence farms. Families were large and few children could be educated. Coffee was the only important export, and the total volume of oversea trade was small, indeed. The beginning of a modernized Puerto Rican economy was the development of sugar as a major export industry.

Growth of the sugar industry provided a necessary base for the more diversified economic development that was to come much later. The method of its development, however, was most damaging to the people of Puerto Rico. The sugar industry, largely owned by U.S. interests, took out from Puerto Rico far more in profits than the amount it invested or reinvested.

The depression of the 1930's hit Puerto Rico with great severity. Sugar and coffee prices tumbled to ruinous levels. Many coffee plantations, which had been severely damaged by hurricanes in 1928 and 1932, were not replanted. Everywhere there was deep social and political unrest. Puerto Rico was on the brink of revolution. Federal relief programs, although substantial in size, were not sufficient to offset the collapse in the economy.

When it did come in 1940, the revolution was a peaceful one. A newly formed political party, led by Luis Muñoz Marín, won a slim victory at the polls. Muñoz had campaigned, not on the traditional basis of Puerto Rico's political status, but on immediate and pressing economic and social issues. He promised bread for the hungry; land for the landless peasant; and freedom from political domination by the absentee sugar companies. His victory brought hope to a people that had for many years been mired in hopelessness.

During the war years, Muñoz and his new Popular Party administration laid the groundwork for the economic and social development programs which were later to be put into high gear. They also had a revenue windfall of \$160 million from countervailing excise taxes on rum, which sold in large quantities in the United States during the war. And although this was badly needed for public assistance and a score of urgent, immediate problems, the government made the decision to invest this revenue in a number of public corporations intended to spearhead Puerto Rico's economic development.

Included among these publicly owned corporations were utility companies in the fields of power, water supply, transportation, and communications. There were five others that had specific economic development objectives—the Government Development Bank, the Industrial Development Co., the Land Authority, and the Agricultural Co. Today, there are 22 public corporations in operation. Most of the larger ones are self-financing and today their assets total well over a billion dollars. Their establishment early in the program and their continued record of sound and constructive management have been major factors in the success of the development program as a whole.

To appreciate the strategy of the development program that was being planned and started in the 1940's, one needs to know something about Puerto Rico and its resources. The island is only about 100 miles long and 36 miles wide. We have sunshine, beaches,

and the sea, mountains, a tropical rain forest.

Coffee and tobacco, and fruits and vegetables are grown in the mountains; and we have a rapidly expanding livestock and poultry industry, which produces about as much farm income as sugarcane, our traditional crop.

It began to be clear even in the 1940's that Puerto Rican economy could not depend primarily on agriculture. The entire surface of the island has less than an acre of land per person and only about a third of it is suitable for crops of any kind. Even forestry is limited by the rugged terrain and by the great variety of trees and undergrowth typical of forests in the tropics. Prospecting for minerals started years ago and continues actively, but none has yet proved exploitable.

With limited land and no commercial resources of fuel or minerals, industrial development has had to be the key element in Puerto Rico's economic development program. But there were many people in the 1940's, including some of the experts, who believed that an industrial program was doomed to failure in a small agricultural country with such limited physical resources. In any case, it seemed quite clear that private investors would not initially undertake so rash a venture unless the Government functioned as a very active catalyst.

At first the Government constructed and operated five factories, but it soon became evident that it would be impossible for the Industrial Development Co. to create jobs for Puerto Rico's rapidly rising population by this method. Some way had to be found to enlist private capital on a large scale in the industrial program. A sound program of tax exemption, which was legislated in 1948, has proved to be the key incentive necessary for the development of private industrial enterprise in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's program of tax incentives and assistance to private industry rests on two basic elements in Puerto Rican-United States relations. In accordance with its association with the United States, Federal taxes (with minor exceptions) do not apply in Puerto Rico and there are no tariffs or other restrictions on the flow of trade and money between the two areas. Since most Federal taxes, including the Federal corporate income tax, do not apply in Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Government, by exempting a corporation from its own taxes, is able to grant complete tax freedom. Under present legislation, it does so for manufacturing and hotel enterprises for a period which ranges from 10 years of tax exemption in the San Juan metropolitan area to 17 years in less-developed parts of the island.

Free trade with the United States, the other key element in United States-Puerto Rican relations, meant that a manufacturing operation in postwar Puerto Rico was not limited to what was then a very small local market. A plant, efficient enough to compete with U.S. producers and also able to pay ocean freight costs, was in a position to sell without any other restrictions in what was, and is, the world's largest common market.

Our promotion efforts were at first slow in yielding results. By 1950 only about 80 new, privately operated plants had been promoted, and most of them were relatively small. By 1955, 300 new privately owned factories had been established. Today, 10 years later, there are more than a thousand new, privately owned factories operating in Puerto Rico. Most of them are affiliates of U.S. manufacturing concerns.

These factories produce over 300 different products. Apparel, textiles, electronics, machinery, and petrochemicals are among the largest and fastest growing of the new Puerto Rican industries. About three-quarters of their output is exported, mostly to the United States. Last year (1963-64), exports

April 28, 1965

of the new industries totaled \$556 million, more than three times the value of our shipments of sugar and other agricultural products. Manufacturing industries now employ 105,000 workers at an average wage of \$1.15 an hour.

Puerto Rico is no longer a one-crop agricultural economy, moreover. Agricultural production has continued to expand and diversify. The value of livestock and poultry products, for example, is now about equal to sugar. But even with a growing total of agricultural production, manufacturing is today more than twice as important as agriculture as a source of income and as a stimulus to the general economy.

To develop manufacturing to the point it has already reached has taken considerably more than tax exemption, free trade, and promotion. The Puerto Rico Economic Development Administration and our vocational education system have had to train thousands of workers and supervisors. Many manufacturers have needed and have received marketing, engineering and other forms of technical assistance, as well as laboratory and testing services. For nearly a decade, the Industrial Development Co. has maintained a stock of about 50 new factory buildings throughout the island ready for immediate occupancy. The company and the Government Development Bank stand ready to participate in almost any kind of financing arrangement that seems mutually beneficial to the prospective manufacturer and to the people of Puerto Rico.

Tourism development was another logical target for Puerto Rico. The island's kind climate, its golden beaches, and its beautiful scenery provided the natural resources on which a major tourist industry could be built. Nevertheless, tourism was a relatively slow starter.

But in the past 7 years the growth of Puerto Rican tourism has been spectacular. We have about 7,000 hotel rooms, two-thirds of which have been built within this 7-year period.

Primarily because of the swift expansion of manufacturing and tourism, the growth of the Puerto Rican economy as a whole has been among the most rapid anywhere in the world. Discounting price increases, the increase in real commonwealth gross product during the past 5 years was 58 percent, an average of 9.5 percent, compounded annually. The largest gains in real gross product or real national income recorded elsewhere by the United Nations were 9.8 percent for Israel between 1952 and 1960, and 9.5 percent for Japan between 1954 and 1960.

It is, of course, a great flow of capital investment that accounts for Puerto Rico's record, or near-record rate of economic expansion. For 7 years, gross investment in fixed capital has been 20 percent or more of Commonwealth Gross Product. Last year it was 24.6 percent. Such a high rate of investment is characteristic of highly-developed countries like Holland, Sweden, Canada, and the United States but not of underdeveloped countries where capital is ordinarily very scarce.

Recognizing the high productivity of new investment in our economy, Puerto Rico has not only welcomed but actively promoted the investment of outside capital. As a result, about half of the funds invested in Puerto Rico have come from external sources, mainly the United States. There are three principal channels through which these funds flow in: First, direct investment, mainly in factories, hotels, and commercial establishments; second, the sale of bonds and other obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and of the public corporations; and third, the purchase of Federal Housing Administration guaranteed mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association (called Fanny May) and other investors outside Puerto Rico.

Direct investment of externally-owned funds in Puerto Rican factories already exceeds half a billion dollars. Outstanding obligations of the Commonwealth and municipal governments and of Puerto Rico's public corporations total nearly a billion. Nearly two-thirds of this is accounted for by the public corporations, of which the Water Resources Authority is the largest.

I have been speaking in economic abstractions. Now let me translate this into human terms. In 1940, Puerto Rico's per capita income was \$121. By 1950 it had inched up to \$279. In 1964 it reached \$832, almost triple the figure of 14 years earlier. Even allowing for price increases, this meant that real per capita income had more than doubled in the past 14 years. In 1950, per capita income in Puerto Rico was barely 18 percent of the U.S. average, but by 1960, it had risen to 30 percent. So even in comparison with the United States, the gap has been closing rapidly. These per capita figures have, of course, deep human meaning. They mean that a man who was worried about being able to afford a pair of shoes 25 years ago, now worries about finding parking space for his Chevrolet; and that the woman who then wondered if she could feed her children, now is concerned with providing them with high school or college education.

Let me cite some revealing indexes of this new, relative prosperity. In only six years, the people of Puerto Rico raised their per capita consumption of animal proteins from 54 percent of the United States average to 82 percent. In these same six years, the registration of motor vehicles increased two-fold, while the number of telephones has doubled in only 3 years. University enrollment is twice that of 9 years ago, and per capita expenditures for public health are now about the same in Puerto Rico as in the United States. One of the most dramatic results is that a Puerto Rican baby at birth can now expect to live to 70 years.

All these are impressive gains, but it is certainly logical to ask how much of Puerto Rico's experience has any relevance to the needs of other developing areas, and how much is peculiar to its own special conditions. Primary among these, of course, is the special economic-political relation with the United States.

Let it be said from the outset that Puerto Rico's spectacular growth could never have been achieved without its special relationship to the United States. But it is equally true that this relationship did not automatically give Puerto Rico a passport to prosperity. The fiscal and trade relations with the United States which exist today are almost precisely the same as those which existed from 1898 to 1940. Yet prior to 1940, the economic situation of Puerto Rico was desperate. The great change in productivity and per capita income has taken place only in recent years, and despite the fact that the economic intrinsics have not changed. "Why?" you may ask.

And here let me say frankly that I will give you a personal opinion, rather than a scientific evaluation. I believe that the heart of Puerto Rico's spectacular growth lies in the very high quality and notable stability of its government; in its true, genuine concern for social as well as economic development, and in its constant consideration of the human element.

Puerto Rico has been fortunate in having a stable, dedicated, democratic local government, whose chief executive and leading figure was Governor Luis Muñoz Marín until his retirement this year. It has been a government characterized by unfaltering devotion to the public welfare, by noteworthy sentiment of honesty, and by the tireless participation of a number of men of unusual competence and imagination.

Secondly, the Puerto Rican Government never lost sight of the fact that its economic

development programs were for people, and that they had to be translated into social and economic benefits for people as rapidly as possible. The people, in turn, having confidence that the government was deeply responsive to their needs and hopes, were willing to make necessary sacrifices over many years while the development programs were getting slowly underway. It was essentially a political challenge and, in all developing areas, one of the most critical and most difficult—to provide inspiration and hope of the type which unleashes a sustained, creative outpouring of energy, even when early, visible returns are meager. Providing this kind of inspiration was one of the outstanding accomplishments of Governor Muñoz and his government.

Finally, both in government and in other fields, there has been an extraordinarily rapid accumulation of education, of expertise, and of skills. Barely 15 years ago, there were virtually no industrial skills or tradition in Puerto Rico, for example. Today, most of the highly sophisticated industrial plants have Puerto Rican managers, to say nothing of Puerto Rican engineers and technicians. A whole new generation of industrial and commercial entrepreneurs has sprung up with astonishing speed. This is only one facet of Puerto Rico's vast effort in education.

In sum, the basic reason for Puerto Rico's rapid growth has been good government, a genuine concern for people, and a passion for education. Stirred together, these have accounted for the explosion of energy which has allowed Puerto Rico to tackle successfully a job which many regarded as impossible.

Indeed, it is fair to say that the economic benefits of Puerto Rico's special relationship with the United States have barely compensated for its dearth of raw materials, lack of local market, and its former lack of industrial tradition or capital. These special benefits merely gave Puerto Rico a fighting chance. Many other developing countries have, on balance, a far more promising pattern of intrinsic circumstances than Puerto Rico has, even today.

In final analysis, which countries succeed and which ones flounder, usually reduces itself to the human element. The great natural riches of any country, in the absence of good government, are only a mockery. Yet basically poor countries can, with good government, achieve remarkable feats, seemingly in defiance of the laws of economic gravity.

Although perhaps the case of Puerto Rico is unusual, this, in my opinion, is the really important lesson of Puerto Rico's development. There are, of course, a number of specific Puerto Rican techniques and experiences which could be studied—and are studied—by other developing countries. I refer, for example, to Puerto Rico's highly effective promotional techniques for attracting maximum amounts of investments and tourists, and the mechanisms of the Economic Development Administration for translating these into income and jobs at an accelerated rate. But in essence, these techniques are meaningless unless there is honesty, dedication, and competence in government, to provide overall planning and leadership. Alongside such prime requirement, all else pales into insignificance.

While the Puerto Rico experience merits the study of underdeveloped countries, in my belief, it also illustrates a very valuable lesson for developed countries. It is these countries which are asked, through various channels, to help finance the development of the poorer countries. For them to do so willingly and enthusiastically it is useful to be able to appeal to their self-interest, as well as to their conscience.

For years the theory of development has been that, once an area was well on the way to higher income, it would become a sufficiently attractive market that the countries contributing to its development would profit

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8447

economically, as well as morally and politically. Here Puerto Rico has become a telling example.

In 1940, when its per capita income was only \$121, Puerto Rico's outside purchases were negligible; it bought an insignificant \$107 million a year from the United States. But in 1964, as a direct result of its growing prosperity, Puerto Rico purchased nearly one and a quarter billion dollars from the continental United States—an increase of more than 10 times.

This level of purchases makes Puerto Rico one of the most important U.S. markets in the world, moreover. Though it is difficult to believe, little Puerto Rico—with only 2,500,000 people—now is a more important market for U.S. products than 17 European nations combined. It buys more from the United States than all 44 countries of the African continent. It purchases more than all the east coast countries of South America, including Brazil and Argentina, plus all the Caribbean Islands combined—a total of 14 countries.

In the entire world, only Canada and Japan buy substantially more from the United States than Puerto Rico; Great Britain, and West Germany purchase slightly more. But on a per capita basis, Puerto Rico is far ahead of all these important markets, buying \$490 per capita per year of U.S. products.

This has become an important factor in the economy of 47 States and there are now 150,000 jobs in the continental United States which are dependent on Puerto Rico's high level of purchases.

In sum, a formerly poor area was an insignificant market. As a direct result of its rapid economic development, however, it has become one of the really important world markets, despite its small size and population. This suggests that, if other underdeveloped countries could also increase their per capita income, even at a much more modest rate, the growth in new and profitable markets for the developed nations could become almost staggering in scale.

I would like to end on a frankly political note. In the Caribbean, historically, Cuba has been a rich island, happily endowed with great expanses of fertile fields, raw materials, and other natural blessings. Puerto Rico has been the poor cousin, whose heavy population pressure against scarce natural resources is one of the most unfavorable in the world. Yet in the 5 years since Castro has ruled rich Cuba, its per capita income has declined by 15 percent. During these same 5 years, Puerto Rico's per capita income has risen by more than 50 percent. I can think of few statistics which are more sobering. And, for developing areas, I can think of none that are more meaningful.

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HELSTOSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE LATE WILLIAM BRUNNER

(Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Queens County, N.Y., has lost a distinguished citizen, a former Member of this body, the Honorable William F. Brunner.

Mr. Brunner gave a lifetime of service to his community, State, and Nation. This man will be sorely missed, and I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his loved ones.

Following is the article outlining the life and service to his fellow man of Mr. Brunner as it appeared in the Long Island Daily Press:

WILLIAM BRUNNER FUNERAL TUESDAY

Former Representative William F. Brunner, of Neponsit, is dead at 77.

He died yesterday in Peninsula General Hospital, Edgemere.

Mass will be offered Tuesday at 10 a.m. in St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church, Belle Harbor.

Burial will follow in St. John's Cemetery, Middle Village.

Mr. Brunner died yesterday at 1:45 p.m. in the hospital which he served as president of the board of trustees for the last 19 years. He relinquished the presidency earlier this month.

Already a patient in the hospital, Mr. Brunner left his hospital bed to attend a dinner in his honor on April 12 when he announced his retirement as president. He was named president emeritus and was presented with a plaque.

The plaque has been set up in the hospital's lobby. The next day, Mr. Brunner was back in his hospital bed.

Mr. Brunner was born in Woodhaven, September 15, 1887, and moved with his parents to Rockaway Beach in 1908.

Throughout his lifetime, his major interest was the Rockaways.

He married the former Theresa Poggi in 1919, and they have a son, William Brunner, Jr., and four grandchildren. Mr. Brunner lived at 145 Ech. 145th Street.

Mr. Brunner graduated from Public School 44, Rockaway Beach in 1902, and attended Far Rockaway High School until 1906. He then attended St. Leonard's Academy and graduated from Packard Commercial School.

At the age of 13 he delivered bread and rolls at 4 a.m. before school, and then again after school for his parent's bakery. He managed and played with the New York Nationals, one of the outstanding professional teams of the era. In 1912 the team, traveling between New York and Minneapolis, won 42 of 45 games. Three years later the team compiled a 45-to-1 record and played at the San Francisco World's Fair.

Before World War I, he engaged in general contracting, trucking, and the ice business under the name of Consolidated Ice & Trucking Corp. He served for 18 months in the Navy during World War I and saw duty abroad the flagship, U.S.S. Seattle.

After his discharge he started a sightseeing bus route between Rockaway Park and Rockaway Point.

While driving a bus, his friends talked him into entering politics. Brunner was elected to the assembly as a Democrat for seven terms beginning in 1922.

As an assemblyman he had legislation passed creating a new municipal court district for the Rockaways and Broad Channel. He cosponsored a bill creating a new city court judge for Queens and additional su-

preme court and county court judges. He sponsored legislation making possible Cross Bay Boulevard, beach protection, and the 7-mile long Rockaway boardwalk.

He was elected to Congress in 1928. While a Congressman for four terms, he was a member of the Post Office Committee. He was responsible for legislation benefiting postal employees and was made an honorary member of the National Post Office Clerks Association.

In 1933 he helped to obtain funds for many new buildings and improvements in Queens, including the Far Rockaway and Flushing Post Office. He was cosponsor of the Home Owners Loan Act which enabled more than 1,500 Queens homeowners, faced with foreclosure, to keep their homes.

Mr. Brunner resigned from Congress in 1935 and was elected Queens Sheriff in 1936. Later that year he resigned to be elected president of the Board of Aldermen.

The last president of New York City's Historic Board of Aldermen, served until 1938 when the board was abolished and the present city council created.

In 1941 he was named by the late Borough President George U. Harvey to serve as commissioner of borough works.

A real estate appraiser, realtor, and insurance broker with offices at 215 Beach 116th Street, Rockaway Park, Brunner kept busy with community affairs.

He was instrumental in advancing the protection of the beach front through the erection of jetties, the building of the 7-mile boardwalk, and the extension of the city's transit system to the Rockaways.

Mr. Brunner served as president of Rockaway Beach Hospital for 14 years and as president of the institution for the past 5 years under its new name of Peninsula General Hospital.

During his administration he spearheaded the campaign to build the new 200-bed, \$5 million building which opened in June 1960, and the \$500,000 nurses and interns residence and auditorium opened this year.

He was presidential chairman of the board of the Rockaway Chamber of Commerce serving as president in 1940, 1941, 1962, and 1963, and as board chairman in 1964 and 1965.

He was a past president of the Rockaway Rotary Club and the Rockaway Park Businessmen's Association, and was a director of the Neponsit Property Owners Association.

Mr. Brunner was past president of the Long Island Real Estate Appraisers; a member of the Long Island Real Estate Board, the New York State Real Estate Board, the National Real Estate Board, and the New York State Real Estate Appraisers, and was a director of the Lawrence-Cedarhurst Federal Savings & Loan Association.

He was also a director of the Queens American Red Cross chapter, the Queens Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and the Queens Division of the United Hospital Fund.

Mr. Brunner served as Queens chairman for the World War II bond drive, the Greater New York fund and the United Hospital fund.

He was a life member of the Queensboro Elks Lodge and the Daniel M. O'Connell American Legion Post. He was also a member of the Rockaway Council of the Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society of St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church, the Hempstead Golf Club, and the Old Timers Basketball Association.

The funeral is under the direction of the Dennis S. O'Connor Funeral Home, 9105 Beach Channel Drive, Rockaway Beach.

END OF THE ROAD WITH
SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(Mr. HERLONG (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

April 28, 1965

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer here a letter received recently by a doctor in this country from Americans now living in Germany.

I think this is another example of the end of the road with socialized medicine:

MUNICH, GERMANY.

DEAR DR. ____: I am sitting around the house recuperating from an appendectomy and naturally our conversation has been related to things medical and eventually we got around to discussing you and medical practices in the States. Therefore, I thought I would take this opportunity, since I have the time, to bring you up to date on the adventures of ____ clan in Germany.

As you probably remember, almost 3 years ago, my wife transferred over here in a pregnant condition. How, I understand, but why, I will never know. To say that she was emotionally distraught by the situation would be an understatement. She had visions of torture chambers and SS doctors experimenting on her. She refused to even see a doctor for the first 7 months. I think we both sort of hoped that if we ignored her condition long enough it might possibly go away. We finally faced the facts and she collected names of several doctors from our English-speaking friends.

The first one we tried had an office in an old building straight out of a Charles Adams cartoon. The doctor himself fit the part. He was shorter than my wife but when he met her he clicked his heels, bowed low, and kissed her hand. There was no physical examination. Just information as to what hospital and the revelation that she would probably not see him again until after the baby was born since a midwife at the hospital took care of all this nasty stuff. As you may well imagine, this just about did it. I was now searching for a competent psychiatrist as well as an O.B.

The second doctor we tried was recommended by a German friend. She was a "Frauen Arzt" who spoke limited English. She was highly recommended as a surgeon and an O.B. Her office downtown was very modern even by stateside standards. She turned out to be quite a character. Her practice was most "privat" which means she had to be good since the Deutschers would never spend their own money for something they could get free from the socialized doctors. She made frequent trips to the States for research and is supposed to be quite famous for a plastic surgery operation on the uterus. She gave my wife an examination and put her on calcium pills. She also gave her the address of a gymnasium where she was supposed to take exercises to prepare her for a "natural childbirth." She promised that she would be at the hospital even though the hospital had an around-the-clock midwife for such things. Claire decided to string along with her since she was the best we had found. That is, everything except the gymnasium.

As it turned out, Claire never really convinced herself that she was going to have this baby in Deutschland. She was 3 weeks late when Dr. ____ put her in the hospital to induce labor. It didn't work and several days later it started itself. I took her to the hospital and into the labor room. They are quite democratic about things like that in a "privat" hospital. In fact I could have spent the afternoon watching the whole show if I so desired.

Her labor was in bed with a pillow. When Claire asked Dr. ____ when they were going to the delivery room she answered that the baby would be delivered right where she was. "What, in a bed?" "Of course." Dr. ____ answered, "where else would you expect a

baby to be delivered?" When Claire told her that all previous babies had been delivered on an operating table she answered, "How horrible." Of course this was no ordinary bed since the foot eventually broke away and there were fittings for stirrups.

All did not go well, however, since Alexander "Der Gross" not only had knotted his cord but also had it wrapped around his neck. It was impossible to knock Claire out completely since every bit of oxygen they could get was needed. He was quite blue when he was finally delivered but fortunately he survived with no ill effects. Dr. ____ explained that Claire had an emotional block that prevented her from delivering the baby on schedule. She said the sac was loaded with excess calcium.

The hospital for a "privat" patient is run quite similar to a hotel. The door is kept closed and nurses come in only for the bare essentials. Visiting is unlimited day or night. No water is ever provided the patients since they are very down on drinking water over here. Claire could have all the beer and champagne she wanted, but no water. "Sekt macht Milch." You ought to try that on your patients if you could run it by the AA.

The price of this "privat" room was about \$9 (United States) a day. In winter they have a Heizung charge of about 75 cents they add on to this. The use of the nursery and the delivery room was about the same or a little cheaper than the States. My Travelers insurance paid for everything except about \$17 of the total bill. Dr. ____ charged \$200 for her fee. This you must realize is about top price here since most people use the government facilities.

We have lived over here almost 3 years and I think I have seen enough to say a few competent words regarding socialized medicine. I feel that Germany is not only 50 years behind but I can't see how they can ever catch up under the present system. The first thing that strikes you is the great number of amputees you see. At first I thought this was due to the war but it suddenly dawned on me one day that most of these people were young and born after the war. The cause of this, and German doctors I have spoken to about it have admitted the same, is that doctors do not have the time, for reasons I'll explain later. They can only go so far and then they amputate. They get so much money for each patient and they cannot let a single patient monopolize their time. They must see an average of 60 patients a day to make a living. About 95 percent of these amputations would be unnecessary by stateside standards. I know of a German family of eight who periodically go to the doctor with imaginary aches and pains because he will prescribe tea for them. They then get their tea free from the government. If you multiply the million of tea drinkers by the number of people who clutter the doctor's office for aspirin, band-aids, eyewash, cotton, etc., it is easy to see why a patient who really needs medical aid cannot get it. The doctor is the middleman in this governmental dispensary but he does not discourage it. He needs the 60 signed yellow slips each day to make a living.

A patient entering a hospital has no doctor responsible for him but is subject to every doctor working in the hospital. A doctor treating a patient in the hospital may find that when he returns the next day, another doctor may have amputated on the patient he was treating. I heard one young doctor complaining that on a "privat" patient no one could do anything unless he had the permission of the doctor in charge of the patient. He said it prevented him from doing a lot of things he wanted to do. All I could do was to whisper, "Thank God."

The Deutscher of today is still not a free-thinking individual. The stigma of the "police state" is still stamped somewhere in the back of his brain. He would rather

be legal than right. He derives maximum security from the multitude of laws and stamped legal documents he must carry for ordinary living. The "Stempel" is his God. Because of this ingrained characteristic he feels that this grist mill they call medicine emanating from the "Bund" is the best they can expect. They accept it without complaint because they have been conditioned for it and chalk up the loss of an arm or a leg as "unglück."

My appendicitis began about 5 weeks ago in Berlin. After about 24 hours of a pain in my side I came back to Munich. Claire drove me to the emergency ward of the public hospital to get a blood count. I was taken to a small room by the intern and given two flat thermometers. I was instructed to crawl up on a narrow table and take my temperatures. The intern then left the room. How these Deutschers can balance on that narrow table and rectally take their own temperature while holding another thermometer in their armpit is an acrobatic feat I will never master. I think I established medical history by having the same temperature at both ends. I now know that if you hold a thermometer under each armpit they will both read 37.5° C. and surprise the doctor.

I finally got the blood count and it registered 11,000. I didn't know if that was high or not but they did want to operate right away. I stalled them and got in touch with Dr. ____ who recommended a surgeon. I entered the hospital on a Sunday evening. I met the doctor and talked to him for about 2 minutes. I was later given a stomach shave and an enema. The next morning I was given a sedative and wheeled to the operating room. There was no physical examination or past history interrogation. I could have been a born bleeder or subject to coronary attacks but the doctor would have never known it. The only information they had on me was my address and that I was a "privat" patient. I was told later that since they don't have the time to do these things with the government patients that most doctors have also eliminated it from their private patients.

It will be 5 weeks tomorrow since the operation and I am still not back to work. I had actually gone to Berlin last Monday to resume flying but I was seized with pains every time I breathed, running from the scar up to the base of my right rib cage. I had to come back to Munich. I saw the doctor yesterday and he explained "auf Deutsch" that my "Blind darm" was on the wrong side of my liver and they had quite a bit of trouble getting it out. He prescribed "spazieren und frische Luft."

Well, enough of this ranting. I just thought that maybe you would be interested in our experience on this medical frontier. Claire said that she may possibly add something so I will close. If you ever possibly tear yourself away and decide to aggravate the outflow of gold by taking a European vacation, we would love to have you stay with us. Give our best to everyone.

Best regards,

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[MR. FASCELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8465

means that the local contractor who had local people working for him would not be subject to the hazard that some contractor from another part of the country might underbid him on the basis that he could import cheap labor into that area and could underbid the local contractor, and depress the local economy.

In the 87th Congress I coauthored an amendment to the administration's Urban Mass Transportation Act which applied the Davis-Bacon principle to that program. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency agreed to the amendment which then became part of the Mass Transportation Act enacted in mid-1964. In 1964, the 88th Congress also accepted revision of the Davis-Bacon Act, which I also coauthored, to include the fringe benefits previously mentioned.

The fact that the Congress has steadily extended and improved the original Davis-Bacon concept is gratifying. However, additional revision is needed. The legislation which I have offered would fill an acute gap in the present law.

The Davis-Bacon concept should be extended to the maintenance contracts—such as those dealing with the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition of a structure or project—which are made after the original construction has been completed. At this time, on military and other Federal installations in my own State and throughout America, we have the strange zigzag pattern where prevailing wages—and thus protection for local contractors and local workers—are honored during the construction phase but ignored when maintenance work—including replacement, modification, reconstruction, or demolition—occurs. Whole crews of out-of-State workers are brought in to perform such work below prevailing local wages while our local contractors and workers are literally standing outside the fence looking in. This condition is neither logical nor consistent. It certainly is not fair. The Federal Government should not condone unfair practices after construction while preventing them during construction. It should not, through inaction, encourage substandard working conditions. Interestingly enough, on State public works projects in California, alteration, demolition, or repair work, as well as construction, have been covered since the "little" Davis-Bacon Act, adopted by the California Legislature in 1937. The State act has worked successfully and has the support of contractors and workers in the areas involved.

Mr. President, revision of the Federal law is long overdue. I hope that the Congress will choose to amend the Davis-Bacon Act along the lines suggested in S. 1797.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 1797 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1797

A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1961, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-6), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. A contract for maintenance work on a public building or public work, including the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition thereof, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a contract for the construction, alteration, and/or repair thereof."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] has asked to be listed as a cosponsor of S. 1675, creating a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws, a bill introduced by me. I ask unanimous consent that he may be included as a cosponsor and that his name be added at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS subsequently said: Mr. President, in my opinion, nothing has greater influence and impact on our business lives and actions than the income tax laws. Therefore, those laws should be so simple that all of us can know in advance the consequences of our acts and business dealings. It is imperative that the income tax laws and returns be simplified.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1670, a bill to provide pollution control tax incentives, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Resolution 102, the name of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce further hearings on the matter of reapportionment of State legislatures. These hearings will be held on May 5, 6, and 7, 1965, in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m.

RESUMPTION OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 1599, AND RELATED BILLS, TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on

Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will resume public hearings on S. 1599, and related bills, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, on May 19 and 20, 1965, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Individuals and groups interested in testifying should contact Mr. Jerome Sonosky in room 162, Old Senate Office Building, extension 2308.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Charles W. Adair, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Panama; William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands; Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey, to be Minister to Bulgaria; Henry J. Tasca, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Morocco; and Henry A. Hoyt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to Uruguay.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRED MOORE VINSON, JR., TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination: Fred Moore Vinson, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWIN L. WEISL, JR., TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination: Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman; the Senator from Arkansas

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 28, 1965

[Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DON J. YOUNG, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nomination: Don J. Young, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Frank L. Kloeb, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ernest W. Rivers, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice William E. Scent, resigned.

Joseph P. Hoey, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

Raymond J. Pettine, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

Olin N. Bell, of Missouri, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

George A. Bayer, of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

Francis M. Wilson, of Missouri, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

E. Herman Burrows, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 17, 1965.

Paul D. Sossamon, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 17, 1965.

John Terrill, of Wyoming to be U.S. marshal for the district of Wyoming for

the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

F. Russell Millin, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 28, 1965.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, May 5, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. DENTON, Mr. Bow, Mr. JONAS, Mr. LAIRD, and Mr. MICHEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. PORF were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Address on the future of Pennsylvania's urban communities, delivered by Gov. William W. Scranton before the general assembly, at Harrisburg, Pa., on April 20, 1965.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article on urban renewal success of Raymond Rebsamen, of Little Rock, Ark., published in the Arkansas Gazette, of April 25, 1965.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Prize-winning essay entitled "How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community," written by Miss Marybeth Meffert, of Boise, Idaho.

Editorial tribute to State Representative T. F. Terrell, of Pocatello, Idaho, published in the Idaho State Journal of April 11, 1965.

JOE THORNE AND THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes beyond the regular 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Easter Sunday, one of South Dakota's most outstanding young men, 1st Lt. Josef L. Thorne, of Brookings, was killed when the helicopter he was piloting was shot down in Vietnam. Joe Thorne, one of the alltime great football stars in South Dakota's history, was known and respected across our State. He was a hero to thousands of South Dakota schoolboys. His death brings the war in Vietnam closer to the heart of every South Dakota citizen.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. M. L. Thorne, of Brookings, Joe was married to the former Diane Hover, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Glen Hover, of Clear Lake, S. Dak. His wife and his 3-year-old son, Travis, have been residing in Clear Lake during his absence. Three brothers, Roy, of Sioux Falls, Tim and Tracy, both at home, and two sisters, Mrs. Dennis Weiland, of New Orleans, and Julie, at home, also survive him.

Mr. President, Joe Thorne was an unusual man. He was described by his coach at South Dakota State University, Ralph Ginn, as "one of the greatest young men I have ever worked with. His football record speaks for itself, but as a man, he was first team all the way."

Coach Ginn continued:

He made a terrific impact on our football. I have never known of a player in our conference that opponents respected more than they did Joe Thorne. We never had a football player at South Dakota State that commanded as great respect of his teammates and coaches as Joe did.

To illustrate Thorne's humility, Coach Ginn told how he would frequently pass up sitting with stars on the football team bus to join some third or fourth stringer who barely got to make the trip.

Mr. President, one of the saddest aspects of Joe Thorne's death is that those closest to him feel that it was a needless sacrifice. His father and mother told me in broken tones over the telephone that they hoped I would do everything in my power as a Member of the Senate to end this "foolish war in Vietnam." These grieving parents expressed the hope that their son's death would dramatize the futility of trying to impose a solution by arms in an area of political chaos and economic misery. Said Mr. Thorne:

It is too late to save Joe, but do everything you can to get those other boys out of there before it is too late. Let's work out a settlement of this war, save our own boys, and stop shooting up that little country.

In a letter which Mr. Thorne sent me following his son's death he referred to photos and movies which his son sent

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8467

home that "depict much of the life of the Vietnamese and the need they have for almost anything other than arms and military." Then he wrote:

Surely, GEORGE, I will do everything within my power to assist you, in bringing to the minds of our people the real need in Vietnam.

Joe's lovely widow, Diane, also told me in a telephone conversation that the only consolation she could draw from his death is the hope that it might somehow hasten a settlement of the war.

Lieutenant Thorne's father sent me a copy of a letter from his son dated February 19, with permission to quote portions of it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter reads as follows:

Today the Vietnamese are having another coup (anyway a breakup in the government). The Army and Air Force (Vietnamese) are fighting among themselves. I still don't know what's going on.

I'm doing fine and don't worry about a big war breaking out over this thing here in Vietnam. To be honest the cause is lost. We can't possibly win (at least as long as the Vietnamese do things the way they do). Don't get me wrong, when I say we can't win, doesn't mean—the United States is getting beat. Lately we have lost some people in hotel bombings, etc., but if the Vietnamese people could be depended on, it wouldn't happen. I don't think the Vietnamese people care one way or another. They are the ones who are getting beat, not us.

You can't win when you can't drive over any road in the whole country. The people can but the soldiers can't.

We could come over here and clean this up, but it wouldn't do any good, cause the same thing would happen when we pulled out.

Mr. President, I believe that there is no American vital interest in the outcome of the Vietnamese turmoil which justifies the death of men like Joe Thorne. There are predictions in the Washington press, more specifically in a recent column by the noted Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, that our Government is preparing to send upwards of 100,000 American boys to Vietnam. Does this mean that we are prepared to sacrifice a hundred thousand Joe Thornes in this highly questionable venture in the southeast Asia jungle? If we take that course we will have ignored the warnings of such respected generals as Dwight Eisenhower and Douglas MacArthur, who have both said that it would be disastrous for America to get sucked into another major land war on the Asian mainland.

I believe that President Johnson is trying to avoid that course. I applaud his repeated offers to enter into negotiations. I only hope that he will marshal all of his great skill and wisdom to seek out every possible way of reaching a peaceful settlement of this war before it claims many more Joe Thornes.

It is encouraging that the President has named Averell Harriman to represent our country in the proposed conference to insure the neutrality of Cambodia. That conference could open a window to discussions of the Vietnamese war. Mr. Harriman was a key figure in

negotiating a settlement in Laos in 1962. He has the experience and the wisdom needed to undertake additional steps toward peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that news accounts of Lieutenant Thorne's death, published in the Brookings Register of April 21; a feature article published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of April 23; and a stirring report on April 20 by KELO-TV sportscaster, Jim Burt, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that two thoughtful editorials, one entitled "Time To Review Our Vietnam Policy," signed by Mr. Fred C. Christopherson and published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of April 25, and the other, entitled "Sincere Dissenter," published in the Watertown Public Opinion of April 19, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles, report, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brookings (S. Dak.) Register, Apr. 21, 1965]

HELICOPTER SHOT DOWN: LT. JOE THORNE VIETNAM CASUALTY

First Lt. Josef L. "Joe" Thorne, 24, son of Mr. and Mrs. M. L. Thorne, of 2028 Elmwood Drive, Brookings, and one of the alltime great football stars at South Dakota State University, was killed Easter Sunday when his helicopter was shot down in Vietnam, his parents were notified by the Department of the Army.

Lieutenant Thorne, a 1963 graduate of State, was assigned to the 145th Aviation Airlift Platoon with the American advisory forces in South Vietnam.

According to the initial telegram received Monday morning by the Thornes, he was aircraft commander of a UH-1B helicopter which was on a combat assault mission Sunday night when his aircraft was hit by hostile small arms ground fire. The craft crashed and exploded on impact.

A second telegram, received Tuesday, verified that Lieutenant Thorne had been identified as one of the casualties.

Mr. Thorne said the body of his son will be brought to Brookings for burial. However, no arrangements had been made at present time today, awaiting further information from the Department of the Army.

A native of International Falls, Minn., where he was born November 17, 1940, Lieutenant Thorne had spent most of his boyhood days at Gettysburg, S. Dak. The family moved to Beresford when he was a junior in high school and he graduated from that school in 1958. He enrolled in the fall of 1958 at South Dakota State University in Brookings, where he starred on the Jackrabbit football teams of 1959, 1960, and 1961, and spent another year at State, receiving a degree in civil engineering in August of 1963.

It was also in August 1963 that he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Reserve Officers Training Corps at State. Assigned to active duty status on September 18, 1963, he attended school at Fort Sill, Okla., then took flight training at Fort Wolters, Tex. and later at Fort Rucker, Ala.

He was assigned to Vietnam the first part of November last year for a 12-month tour of duty, and was nearing the halfway mark in his oversea tour at the time of his death.

Lieutenant Thorne was married to the former Diane Hover, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Glen Hover, of Clear Lake, and was the father

of a 3-year-old son, Travis. Mrs. Thorne and their young son had been making their home in Clear Lake while he was in Vietnam, and she was enrolled as a student at State.

In addition to his wife and son, Lieutenant Thorne is survived by his parents; three brothers, Roy, of Sioux Falls, Tim and Tracy, both at home; and two sisters, Mrs. Dennis Welland, of New Orleans, La., and Julie, at home.

[From the Brookings (S. Dak.) Register, Apr. 21, 1965]

THORNE ONE OF ALLTIME GRID GREATS AT STATE

A name that will not soon be forgotten in the annals of South Dakota State grid greats, Joe Thorne appears destined to go down in history as one of the finest athletes to ever wear the blue and gold of the football jackrabbits.

A two-time all-North Central Conference selection, Thorne was killed Sunday night when his assault helicopter was shot down by hostile gunfire over Vietnam.

Thorne, named by the Associated Press as second team Little All-American selection in 1961, holds three school records. It was in that same year that he scored 50 points in NCC play and tied with Dan Boals, of State College of Iowa, for "most valuable back" honors in the conference.

Said Ralph Ginn, head football coach at State upon learning of the death of Thorne, "This certainly brings the war close to home when we lose a young man such as Joe. His loss is a terrific loss to our society."

Ginn often referred to his 191-pound back as "the best fullback I've ever had." His blocking ability and his prowess on defense earned him the respect of his coach as much as his running talents did.

Thorne's 3 school records, all set in 1961, include most times carried in 1 game, 30 against SCI; most carries in 1 season, 174, and most net yards in 1 game, 200 against Morningside.

But it wasn't on the grid turf alone that Thorne stood out. Said Ginn, "As far as the boy is concerned, he was one of the greatest young men I've ever worked with. His football record speaks for itself, but as a man he was first team all the way."

Ginn continued, "In your years of coaching you work with a lot of boys. It seems like some become a part of you. That's the way it was with Joe."

"He made a terrific impact on our football. I've never known of a player in our conference that opponents respected more than they did Joe Thorne. It was the same every place."

Ginn commented that it was too bad opponents didn't have the opportunity to know him other than in football.

"We've never had a football player at South Dakota State that commanded as great respect of his teammates and coaches as Joe did." Coach Ginn labeled Thorne "a great captain." He was cocaptain with Mike Sterner of the 1961 team when the Jackrabbits shared the league title with State College of Iowa.

Thorne was named "most valuable" member of the Jackrabbit football team, both in 1960 and 1961, by the Brookings Rotary Club and the Collegian, campus newspaper at State.

In 3 years (1959-61) as a member of Jackrabbit football teams, he gained a total of 2,156 net yards rushing in 426 carries, for a healthy 5-yard-per-carry average. He scored 140 points during his 3-year career, including 12 touchdowns and 2 points after touchdown—74 points—in 1961; 7 touchdowns and 3 points after touchdown for 48 points in 1960; and 3 touchdowns for 18 points in 1959.

April 28, 1965

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Apr. 25, 1965]
LETTERS AND GIFTS ARRIVE AFTER WORD OF THORNE'S DEATH
 (By Bob Renshaw)

CLEAR LAKE, S. DAK.—Too young to comprehend that his daddy will not be coming home, 3-year-old Travis Thorne played with candy eggs the Easter bunny brought to the home of his grandparents, Dr. and Mrs. G. F. Hover.

He has been living here with his mother while his father, Lt. Joe Thorne has been overseas. In the last letter to his wife Thorne, who was one of the alltime great football stars at South Dakota State University, told of plans to attend an Easter service on the beach in Vietnam where he was serving as a helicopter pilot.

That letter, along with two others, arrived after she had been notified that her husband had been killed when his helicopter was shot down Easter Sunday night. Easter gifts—a Vietnamese robe for his wife and suit for his son—as well as gifts for his younger brother in Brookings and for a neighbor girl with whom Travis plays have also come since his death.

REQUESTS DUTY

When he first arrived in Vietnam, according to Mrs. Thorne, he flew VIP's and mail for a couple of weeks and then started flying troops into battle. He requested duty as pilot of an armed ship. His wife said he explained that he would be flying in the same combat areas and it would be no more dangerous flying an armed helicopter than an unarmed troop carrier.

Mrs. Thorne said he had told her father that he wasn't afraid of dying, but that he hated to leave Diane and Travis for so long. Some of his loneliness for his family was expressed in his last letter when he said, " * * * You know, Diane, all the things I've done over here. Well, all I have to do now is repeat everything and it will be time to come back. Hope God stays with us and sees fit for me to return. No sense worrying about it."

SENSES TENSION

His last letter was written at the forward base of Nah Trang on the back of his orders because he had left his stationery at the home base in Phan Thiet. Mrs. Thorne said that in his letters starting with March 30 she seemed to detect a feeling of growing tension.

April 5 for the first time he told of enemy fire coming close, with tracer bullets striking within a half mile of the hotel where he was staying. Lack of good housing had never been a problem because troops are billeted in old resort hotels built by the French during the time they were in Vietnam.

Mrs. Thorne said his letters told how sorry he felt for the children in Vietnam, how they would gather around in swarms when the helicopter landed and how they loved to have their pictures taken.

Funeral services for Lieutenant Thorne will be held at South Dakota State University, Brookings, when the body has been returned. Mrs. Thorne requested that all memorials be sent to the Joe Thorne Memorial Fund, South Dakota State University. It will be used to establish an athletic scholarship at the university.

She said her husband didn't care for a lot of publicity. "Joe really didn't like big splashes. He would be saying 'no' to all this," she continued. "He was very sincere about everything and hated a big show. He wanted people to like him for what he was."

ECHOES SENTIMENTS

Ralph Ginn, who coached Thorne at South Dakota State University, echoed Mrs. Thorne's sentiments. "Joe wanted to be good and was willing to pay for it. But he got a

real thrill from achieving and not from the glory that went with it," said Ginn.

To illustrate Thorne's humility, Ginn told how he would pass up sitting with stars on the bus to join some third or fourth stringer who barely got to make the trip. "He was very appreciative of what coaches and others did for him," said Ginn. "I never heard him criticize a teammate and he never allied to me. I never had a player who held so much respect of teammates, coaches and opponents."

JIM BURT'S SPORTS SCOREBOARD, APRIL 20, 1965

BURT. The war in Vietnam came closer to home today. Especially to those who knew Joe Thorne. The former South Dakota State football star's body was recovered today after the helicopter he was piloting was shot down yesterday. When such a tragedy occurs, it gives cause for reviving exploits of an individual—and with Joe Thorne, this is not difficult. (Pix.)

PIX NO. 1. We can easily recall watching and describing Thorne's explosive running—his devastating blocking. He was one of the most brilliant grid performers we have seen. Thorne's name still is attached to three South Dakota State school football records. Most times carried in one game—30—most times carried in one season—174 and most net yards gained in one game, 200.

BURT. He was cocaptain of the Jackrabbit football team in 1961. All North Central Conference fullback in 1960 and 1961. He tied with Dan Boals of SCI in 1961 for Most Valuable Back Award. He won the Collegian's Most Valuable Player Award both in 1960 and 1961. In 1961 he was second in the North Central Conference scoring with 50 points. In his 3-year varsity career he carried 426 times—gained 2,178 yards, lost only 22, for a net of 2,156. In his senior year his average per carry was 5.5 yards. He scored 22 touchdowns, ran for 4 extra points, for a scoring total of 140 points. He was named second team fullback on the 1961 AP Little All-American team. Thorne was drafted by the Green Bay Packers but never played pro ball. His football record is there to be admired—and challenged. But, Joe Thorne as an individual went deeper than that. As Head Football Coach Ralph Ginn said "As a man he was first team all the way." (Pix.)

PIX NO. 2 (super name).

BURT. Those comments are typical of those who were closely associated with the former star athlete. Joe's wife Diane lives at Clear Lake with her parents and 3-year-old son Travis. She said, "Joe loved what he was doing. He was fighting for a cause and never once did he complain or regret what he was doing. I'm sure Joe had no regrets, he could never sit on the sidelines." Coach Ginn said he has never known a player in the North Central Conference which commanded more respect from opponents. Joe probably flew his copter like he played football. An intense, determined, bulldozing runner who saw no barriers. Joe Thorne joins a list of valiant Americans who have fought—and died—heroically for their country. Joe Thorne—the athlete—and the man—will long be remembered.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Apr. 25, 1965]

CHRISTOPHERSON'S NOTEBOOK: TIME TO REVIEW OUR VIETNAM POLICY

The expanding military activity in Vietnam is disconcerting, and more and more people are beginning to wonder just how and where it will end.

About the developments in Vietnam today is a scene of frustration and uncertainty comparable to that which prevailed while the Korean struggle was underway several years ago.

In respect to Korea, there was confusion

about our objectives and our methods. The same attitude exists now.

The conflict in Korea was terminated, happily, before it broadened into a major war. Many like to believe that the Vietnam episode will end similarly. But there's doubt, plus bewilderment, accentuated by the realization the problem seems to become more perplexing week after week.

KEEN PUBLIC INTEREST

This deep concern about Vietnam was very likely the reason why an overflow crowd assembled at luncheon in Nettleton Manor Thursday to hear Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, discuss the matter. The luncheon was first scheduled to be a small one with members of the Public Affairs Committee and the directors of the Chamber of Commerce. But so many were eager to be present that the public generally was invited.

Perhaps the interest was intensified by the fact that McGOVERN previously had indicated a difference with the administration on Vietnam policy, suggesting that we should explore the possibilities of negotiating a settlement.

In his Thursday speech here, he explained why he considered negotiation both desirable and feasible. And, judging from the reception he received and the close attention paid to his remarks, there were many in the audience who shared his opinion.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The question about alternatives naturally arises. If we don't negotiate, what do we do?

One answer is to say we should either go into Vietnam with great enough strength to smash the opposition. Another is that we should withdraw.

Flaws can be found, however, with both of these suggestions.

If we go into the conflict with a full determination to smash the opposition, we invite sharp retaliation from both Red China and Russia. And that means moving right to the brink of major war and perhaps over it. We faced the same problem in Korea and our leaders wisely refrained from taking that gamble.

The other prospect—that of withdrawal—is also inadequate. If we do so, it may be maintained through the Asiatic southeast that we are, as the Red Chinese insist, just "a paper tiger." Withdrawal would be heralded widely as an American defeat and a Red Chinese triumph and it could be charged that we had deserted those who had depended on us.

WE DO HAVE STRENGTH

Between the two alternatives—an all-out smash or withdrawal—is the possibility of negotiation.

There are those who say that this isn't the time for a discussion of that and we should wait until we are ready to negotiate from strength. This means, of course, after we have beaten North Vietnam into a state of at least partial submission.

One may be sure, though, that the Red Chinese also may be reluctant to allow us to acquire this so-called position of strength. There will be growing resistance.

But what seems to be overlooked by many is that we are right now, as Senator McGOVERN pointed out Thursday, in a position to negotiate from strength.

We have the power in the Pacific and Asiatic waters to smash Red China to bits. The Red Chinese know this. And when you have that kind of strength behind you, you aren't negotiating from a position of weakness. We could approach the conference table with some mighty powerful cards on our side and those negotiating with us would be well aware of this.

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8469

WHAT WE DID IN KOREA

Every major step taken in this extraordinary day and age involves, of course, a calculated risk.

That was the case when President Eisenhower aided in the negotiation of the settlement in Korea. But the fighting was stopped and our prestige was unharmed.

It is entirely possible that the same step can be taken in respect to Vietnam. With proper negotiation, very likely something can be done to maintain a degree of prestige on both sides.

Just what can be done in respect to the self-government of Vietnam is, I grant, a disturbing problem. The government has changed freely there even under our supervision and may shift just as readily in the future.

OPEN MINDS NEEDED

What may be said in general is that the whole situation is so confusing that it is well that our minds be kept open. Negotiation may or may not be the answer but surely we should explore its possibilities in complete detail.

We are heading directly, as someone said the other day, along a collision course with Red China. Let's utilize the power of our strength to try to make a change before it is too late.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, Apr. 19, 1965]

SINCERE DISSENTER

There are many degrees of political courage but South Dakota Senator GEORGE McGOVERN is exhibiting one of the greatest—espousal of the unpopular side of a great national issue, even as his political peers try to shut him up.

The issue: Should the United States become increasingly involved in South Vietnam at the dangers of an escalated war loom greater?

McGOVERN's stand: No.

He stands fast on this line and hasn't been chary about saying so, even when such personal friends and influential big names as HUBERT HUMPHREY and McGeorge Bundy have urged him to keep silent on behalf of national unity. McGOVERN keeps right on opposing the U.S. role in Vietnam and doing so out where lots of people see and hear him.

Chicken? Appeaser malcontent? By no means. McGOVERN points out that he is neither a pacifist nor an isolationist but simply, "I don't believe military aid can be used effectively in southeast Asia. The problems there are ones of internal political revolution."

In other words, in the McGovern book, America is charging along a jungle path in Vietnam that is not only militarily futile but very costly and extremely dangerous. He recently told Bucknell University students, "It seems clear that we are now on a spiral of blows and counterblows which could lead to a major war under the worst possible conditions for the United States."

He has recalled his food-for-peace days and reflected: "The extensive traveling I did in Asia and Latin America convinced me that the basic problems in these areas are ones of hunger, illiteracy, and bad government. These are the problems we should attack. In South Vietnam, we inherited the hostility and mess that came from 50 years of French misrule and exploitation."

McGOVERN obviously is under no illusions as to the political hazard of his own position. For the junior Senator from a prairie State to so adamantly oppose a major policy and commitment of his own party and administration, and to do it repeatedly while spurning big brother attempts to shush him, takes a brand of nerve one doesn't see very often these days, particularly not in politics. And

to compound it, McGOVERN displayed something of the same independent attitude when he openly expressed his disappointment over some facets of the administration's new farm program *** and vowed to work to correct them.

McGOVERN's views have not prevailed and it is unlikely that they will. But whether they do or not, the man who endorses them, and does so most effectively, has increased his stature among many people for his sincerity, his steadfastness, and his willingness to "go for broke" in behalf of an ideal he honestly believes is right.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I shall defer to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the debate on the voting rights bill has continued, I have become more and more amazed that the Senate would even seriously consider passing the section of the bill that would abolish poll taxes in State and local elections. I shall not speak on this subject now, except to sound a grave warning that to pass a bill to abolish the poll tax by statute would actually leave our Constitution in shambles and would make a mockery of the Senate's responsibility. The real question before the Senate is not the approval or disapproval of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

The real and only question is the constitutional question as to whether the Senate has the power and authority to pass such a measure by means of a statute. No less a person than the President of the United States, yesterday in a press conference, said that to abolish the poll tax requirement by statute would raise a constitutional problem. He said he believed that if the poll tax were to be abolished, it must be abolished by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That statement comes from the highest source of responsibility under our Federal Government. Certainly those are not idle words and this statement by the President is consistent with what he said as a Senator on March 9, 1949—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2047. The President—then a Senator from Texas—said:

The framers of the Constitution of the United States were plain, specific, and unambiguous in providing that each State should have the right to prescribe the qualifications of its electorate and that the qualifications of electors voting for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications of electors voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. For that reason, and that reason alone, I believe that the proposed anti-poll-tax measures introduced in previous sessions of this body and advocated in the President's civil-rights program is wholly unconstitutional and violates the rights of the States guaranteed by section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Not only has the President recently spoken on this subject, but also the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Katzenbach, has stated most recently that the provision of the bill that would abolish the poll tax in the election of

State officers is invalid. The Attorney General made that statement in his testimony before our subcommittee. He also made the statement to a national television audience recently on "Meet the Press."

Not only have those two high officials spoken out on this issue, but also the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are opposed to that part of the bill which attempts to abolish the poll tax by statute. They know that it would be unconstitutional to do so.

That the poll tax cannot be repealed without constitutional amendment is so well settled and firmly established that further discussion of the question would seem unnecessary. In 1960, by a vote of 50 to 37, the Senate clearly established the precedent that a constitutional amendment was necessary to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections. In 1962, the Senate reaffirmed that position when it adopted a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment applicable to Federal elections. That amendment is now part of the Constitution. In the course of debate on that resolution the Senate rejected by a vote of 59 to 34 the contention that the poll tax could be abolished by mere statute.

The Attorney General of the United States has said that the provision with regard to abolishing the poll tax in the election of State officers is invalid. He made that statement in his own testimony before our subcommittee, and he also made it to a national television audience on "Meet the Press."

The distinguished majority leader is opposed to that part of the bill which attempts to abolish poll taxes by statute because it would be unconstitutional to do so. The distinguished minority leader has stated his opposition to this section of the bill on the grounds that it is unconstitutional.

The law on this is as clear as a bell.

In 1951 the Supreme Court affirmed *Butler v. Thompson*, 97 F. Supp. 17, (D.C.E.D. Va., 1951), wherein the district court cited the case of *Breedlove v. Sutles*, 302 U.S. 277 (1937), and held:

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the 14th amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the 15th and 19th amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

That decision of the U.S. Supreme Court now stands as the law of the land. It is there for all to see. It is absolutely clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, every Member of Congress is under duty to

April 28, 1965

support the Constitution of the United States. This is a constitutional matter that must be acknowledged. Every Senator must be governed by it, whether or not he agrees with its holding.

I do not impugn the integrity or sincerity of anyone. I point out that the decision should be made by each individual Senator. It cannot be avoided or delegated to another party by merely shrugging the shoulders and saying, "We elect to let the courts pass on it." That procedure would not follow the letter or spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

Every Senator must be governed by the constitutional conclusion that he may have on this question, regardless of how he may feel with reference to the poll tax itself.

The proposed bill was drafted in the atmosphere of massive public demonstrations, introduced in the Senate, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; under such limitations it was necessary that the committee hold only a few days of hearings and then frantically meet in executive session to report a bill. On several occasions, reports reached the public that a revised or substitute version had been agreed upon by a majority of the committee; then, before that substitute could hardly be printed, numerous amendments would be offered thereto. Finally, upon the last day in which the committee had to consider this measure, what may well be called a conglomerate bill was put together and reported to the Senate.

I commend the majority and minority leaders, the Attorney General of the United States, and the President for coming out positively and definitely with a firm and correct statement on this matter. It seems to me, with all due deference to every Member of this great body, that merely to let the court decide such a measure would be a dereliction of our duty.

How derelict of our strict duty can we become? How much can we abdicate our responsibilities as members of the legislative branch of the Government just because the marchers march in Washington and at the White House? I cannot believe that a majority will succumb to this emotional appeal to set aside the Constitution. I know that we should promptly vote this provision down.

I hope that we may have an early vote upon this far-reaching act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I command the Senator from Mississippi for his very fine statement. I wish to associate myself with his statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Mississippi.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF YESTERDAY ON VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President's news conference of yesterday

marked another effort on the part of his administration to cloak a policy of war in the mantle of peace.

But all the while the President speaks of our desire for peace, he ignores all the efforts the United States has led in the last 20 years to devise means of keeping peace. I refer to our participation in and support of the United Nations and of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The President speaks eloquently about the lessons of history. But he has missed the greatest lesson of all, which is that no one nation can determine where and how the peace shall be kept without fighting external wars.

The specter of Munich, which was raised yesterday by the President, is the favorite image of the advocates of the war in Vietnam. But which of them is willing to argue that in 1938 the United States should have sent troops to Czechoslovakia to fight Germany alone? Which of them is willing to say that the intervention by Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union into the Spanish Civil War was a good thing because each of them thought they were stopping the other's aggression before it could get started?

The real lesson of Munich and the Spanish Civil War is that nations acting unilaterally to protect their self-interest as they see it are going to get into wars. It is especially tragic to see two great ideological contestants again fighting over the prostrated body of a third country, very much as the fascists and Communists fought over the corpse of Spain, all in the name of preventing someone else's alleged aggression.

It was because of the events that led up to World War II and because of the war itself that the United Nations was set up, and no nation desired more earnestly than the United States that it be used to save mankind from another scourge of war.

Yet when the President of the United States talks about the international history of the last 27 years and its lessons, he makes no mention at all of the United Nations and its peace-keeping function. Apparently we are well on the way to emulating the French Bourbons who forgot nothing and learned nothing.

The President is quite wrong in believing that we who oppose our policy in Vietnam have ignored the terror and the bombings committed by the Communists. No doubt his attention is drawn to our criticisms and not to our condemnations of the Communists. But one can hardly say that Americans have the right to fight a civil war in another land and still remain immune from retaliation or attack. I have roundly criticized time and time again the tactics and terrorism of the Vietcong. I have criticized the bombing of the American Embassy in Saigon, and the killing and maiming of innocent civilians, both American and South Vietnamese. Likewise I have criticized the atrocities of the South Vietnamese practiced upon the Vietcong with U.S. military standing by doing nothing to enforce the Geneva Treaty covering the treatment of war prisoners. I have criticized terrorism and atrocities committed by Vietcong.

Of course the sad part is that the United States cannot expunge the record as to our own involvement in this dirty war. We have escalated it. We have participated in it. We have walked out on our peace keeping obligations under international law.

What in the world would lead the President to think that North Vietnam would not attack, starting with our escalation at Tonkin Bay? We can start with the American course of action in Tonkin Bay. From that time on, North Vietnam has proceeded at an ever-escalating rate to make war. We asked for it. We should have taken North Vietnam's violations of international law at Tonkin Bay to the United Nations instead of going beyond the point of self-defense by committing acts of aggression of our own.

We have made the Vietnam civil war our war, and no one has done more to make it our war than President Johnson. In my opinion, we have been fortunate so far that our casualties have been so light and the attacks upon American civilians as few as they have been.

I invite the President's attention to the fact that despite the barrage of statistics from the Pentagon seeking to demonstrate that the Vietcong are being killed in large numbers, and that they are killing large numbers of civilians in South Vietnam by terrorist methods, the Pentagon informs me that it has no figure of any kind on the number of Vietnamese civilians killed by the military activities of the United States and the South Vietnam Army. Yet people who have been to that sad country tell of hospitals being filled with victims of our air raids and our fire bombings, and the ground activities of the South Vietnamese Army. Also no statistics are being given the American people of the civilians the bombings in North Vietnam are killing.

It takes at least two to make a war. We are one of the parties making it in Vietnam today.

The President's press conference yesterday was a graphic demonstration of how impossible it is for contesting parties to prevent war, or to stop a war before it can get started. All the administration is able to do under its present policy is to do what nations have been doing for hundreds of years before us, and that is to try to justify its own war.

With the hope that it may in some form reach the President's eyes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a speech prepared by Benjamin V. Cohen entitled "The United Nations in Its Twentieth Year," and delivered at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem on April 27, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Cohen outlines the obligations of the great powers to observe the United Nations Charter. I am satisfied that neither the United States nor the rest of the world will escape the scourge of war until we do, in fact, observe that charter.

Do not forget that Mr. Cohen is not only one of our greatest international

lawyers but also do not forget that during his period of service to the U.S. Government, he has represented it in several international conferences.

Mr. President, I close by inviting the attention of the Senate to an announcement just received on the ticker, as follows:

SAIGON.—Air strikes against North Vietnamese roads, bridges, and railroads are not choking off aid to the Vietcong, and a land invasion of the north should begin immediately, the commander of South Vietnam's Air Force says.

"If we are just going to bomb communication lines, the Vietcong will be able to stand up for a long time, I'm afraid. So the next step must be big—either a big escalation of the war or negotiations," Brig. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky told the Associated Press in an exclusive interview today.

While the bulk of the raids against North Vietnam have been flown by U.S. Air Force and Navy planes, Ky's propeller-driven Skyraider bombers also have been over North Vietnam nearly every day.

The 34-year-old general has flown three of the missions himself and was grazed by enemy flak on one of them. Three of his pilots have been shot down.

"The raids against communications are not really effective," he said. "The Communists can always find ways of moving through the jungle.

"But if we were to set up a kind of 'national liberation front' in the north, we could do the same things to the Communists that they've been doing to us here. We have superiority in the air over North Vietnam's central area from the 17th to the 20th parallels, and we could easily supply guerrillas of our own there.

"The people in that area are basically anti-Communist and I'm sure they would help us. Then we could really start cutting their supply lines and giving them something to worry about."

Let there be no doubt in the minds of the American people that our South Vietnamese allies are going to continue to put on the pressure that the United States escalate the war into a big front in Asia.

I repeat—what the administration does not like to hear me say—namely, a deep conviction of mine based upon my conclusions from the briefings I have received as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that if we follow the Johnson course of action in Asia, in not too many months from now we shall be involved in a massive war in Asia which will take hundreds of thousands of American boys to Asia.

What is the alternative that we should try? It is an alternative that the President has not attempted to try.

In my judgment, the only way the President can prove his intentions for a peaceful settlement of the war in Asia is to proceed to use the procedures of international law as they now exist. That means that the President should lay the problem before the United Nations, pledging his cooperation to the United Nations to help enforce the peace in Asia. We should ask our alleged allies, who are also signers of the United Nations Charter, to assume their obligation to take United Nations action in southeast Asia.

Until the President does that, he will continue to be justifiably criticized, as I have been criticizing him.

If we wish peace, we must resort to peaceful procedures to accomplish that end, instead of making statements which seek to shroud the war in Asia with peace talk.

Once more I repeat that the United States is no longer in a position that permits it to conduct bilateral negotiations with North Vietnam, the Vietcong and Red China. Negotiations for peace must now be conducted by nonparticipants sitting at the head of the table under the auspices and procedure of the United Nations.

Mr. President, the administration is going to great lengths through its own officials and through newsmen it can influence to depict the protests on American campuses against our Vietnam war as irresponsible, "off-beat," and disreputable. Last week, on April 22 and 23, a "teach-in" on the Vietnam war was held at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent to have three articles from the campus paper, the Rutgers Daily Targum of April 26, printed at the close of these remarks. One is an editorial headed: "The Dawn of a New Era." The second is a letter to the editor from Hank Wallace, and the third is a report entitled: "Teach-in Triumph," written by Steve Herman.

This report on the value, the impact, and the conclusions of a teach-in on the Rutgers campus cannot be brushed off by an administration and a Secretary of State anxious to silence questions and criticisms of an anxious intellectual community. If they continue trying to do so, they are going to find themselves deserted and frankly opposed by an increasingly large body of American public opinion.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutgers Daily Targum, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE DAWN OF A NEW ERA

The dawn surely rose over Warren Susman Friday morning. As daylight broke through the foggy horizon surrounding Scott Hall at 5:30 a.m., so did the dawn of a new era in the history of the university break through as Susman began to talk. It was a brilliant climax to what will go down as the greatest event at Rutgers in the last 25 years—it is not likely to be duplicated for another 25.

FEVER PITCH

The teach-in Thursday night-Friday morning to protest the war in Vietnam was, indeed, the faculty and student body's finest hour. The electric intensity which accompanied the magnificent and impassioned faculty oratory spread infectiously throughout the 1,000-man audience until it reached a fever pitch during the now historic Susman-Fitzpatrick exchange. Never again will this university, in all likelihood, see a similar expression of political-emotional sentiments expressed by such a percentage of the student body.

Although we have complained in the past about student nondirection and nonactivity, we were stunned by the turnout and the general seriousness of purpose which characterized Friday's rally. Although the atmosphere was one of gaiety—helped along, no doubt, by relaxation of Douglass curfew laws—there was an overriding importance to the students involved which extended far beyond the scope of socialization.

For once, the university was truly a forum of ideas. A certain portion of the faculty proved incontrovertibly that they were responsible to both their profession and to the student body.

Contrary to James Reston in Wednesday's New York Times, this was not "propaganda of the most vicious nature." This was a logical, clear forward interchange of ideas—it is unfortunate, perhaps, that the "stay-in-the-war" partisans could not have found a more effective spokesman for themselves than William Fitzpatrick. He was hopelessly outclassed.

HIGH POINT IN DRAMA

The teach-in team was superb. Susman was at his bombastic, dazzling, persuasive and didactic best. His interlude with Fitzpatrick hit a high point in sheer drama never again to be equaled. The three standing ovations he received during his peroration were indicative of the heights of esteem in which the student body holds him. The cold assertive logic of Lloyd Gardner's assessment of American-Asian relations, and the southern tones of Carter Jefferson's survey of the French role in southeast Asia best complemented Susman's oration.

There was one extremely sour note sounded, however. Notwithstanding the apparent spuriousness of the alleged "Colonel" of the "Christian Unity Party"—purported neo-Fascist front—we have nothing but utter contempt for the university students who went along with the hoax. We do not particularly consider the Nazi Party to be an amusing divertissement. We are also in no way amused by either the sickeningly infantile and puerile actions of the students who "sieg heiled" along with Stetler or by the students who disgraced themselves and the university with their vile banners in Scott Hall. Such apparently psychopathic minds have no place in any institution of higher learning.

Disregarding this one blemish, the teach-in was a brilliant success. The faculty has proven themselves to be responsible to the student body and the student body has proven themselves worthy of a topflight faculty. We may never see its like again.

LETTERS: FINEST 8 HOURS

DEAR SIR: Years from now Rutgersmen will say this was their finest 8 hours.

The potential of our university was realized at the teach-in Friday morning.

Pulled together in a few days by a small group of professors, everything clicked:

Proponents on all sides of the Vietnam problem were spontaneous and outspoken, yet the exciting lecture series and the effectively distributed breaks were kept tightly on schedule but not stifled by coordinator Dr. Seymour Zenchelsky.

Happily, Rutgers College's finest hours were shared by hundreds of Douglass girls, for whom curfew was waived to further the coedizing of the new Rutgers University.

Student response was overwhelming: Scott Hall walls were lined with standees through half the morning, and an astonishing number of students saw the adjournment at 8.

Luckily WRSU recorded the entire program on a dozen tapes. Jan Plosnick recommended at 7:30 a.m. that an audio transcript be sent to the White House.

Perhaps a written transcript also could be produced in booklet form, available to students, faculty, and the public.

Since the time of the flood 200 years ago, Rutgers has never more nearly approached its destiny as a great university.

HANK WALLACE

TEACH-IN TRIUMPH

(By Steve Herman)

The clock radios went off, alarm clock bells rang, people groggily got out of bed, washed up, and then hurried to their first period

April 28, 1965

class. It was the beginning of another day. For others, however, Friday morning was the end of what must be described as one of the most exciting and wonderful evenings in their lives. For at 8 a.m. "the teach-in" to expose students to the various issues in problems in connection with the Vietnam problem came to an end.

The lecture discussion marathon began at 12 midnight in Scott Hall 123 before approximately 1,000 students—most of whom were either concerned and worried about U.S. policy in Vietnam or were just curious to see what the whole thing was about.

The audience was not made up of "kooks," but consisted of a cross section of the Rutgers community. And, as a matter of fact, the only "kooks" who were present were some very unsophisticated and crude representatives of the campus radical rightwing fringe. They carried signs with such slogans as "Better Dead than Red," "Blast the Chinks," and "—— communism." These "kooks" also tried to rattle and heckle some of the professors, but they were all skillfully "put down." (After observing the performance of some of these characters, one student commented "the lack of political acumen of the rightwingers is exceeded only by their stupidity.")

At 12 when Professor Zenchelsky started the program, Scott 123 had a standing-room-only crowd, with people sitting on the stage, in the aisles, and in the lobby outside the room. The crowd surpassed any expectations that anyone may have had and it was a credit to most of the people there that they remained courteous and attentive for 8 hours.

Even more credit, however, has to go to the dozen professors who participated in this demonstration. They were all magnificent (Warren Susman was "super")—they had to be to keep the attention of such a large crowd. There was no repetition from one professor to another, each was an expert on his subject, and each one added something which was very constructive. They all spoke from the heart as well as the mind and their sentiments were felt by the entire audience.

Sitting in Scott Hall—a little dizzy at times because of the smoke and lack of sleep—one got the impression that "this is college." There was a free and unobstructed exchange of some very controversial ideas on a most important and meaningful topic. And the message that the scholars were so eloquently sending was being received by a large and very enthusiastic audience.

It seemed that in the middle of the night on last Friday—an apathetic, disinterested, and bored student body had come to life—it was serving a purpose—it was accomplishing something. After leaving the teach-in—whether one agreed with the views or not—you had the feeling that something extraordinary had taken place. Something constructive was done—time was spent with professors who spoke on a topic on which there would be no test, no grade, no quiz.

Once again thank you profs—you were all great—it was an evening which will never be forgotten and an experience that unfortunately will probably not be repeated.

EXHIBIT 1

THE UNITED NATIONS IN ITS 20TH YEAR: THE DAVID NILES MEMORIAL LECTURE AT THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, APRIL 27, 1965

(By Benjamin V. Cohen)

It is a high honor to be asked to inaugurate the David Niles Memorial Lectures at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

I was privileged to know David Niles. He was a retiring, self-effacing man of quiet powers. Even with his close friends he subordinated his person to his work and to their work and even more frequently to other people's welfare. He was by profession a social worker and both in public office and in non-

governmental work his principal concern was to help disadvantaged persons and groups to participate on a basis of equality in the life and work of the community in which they chose to live.

Quite early in his career he became interested in politics and government in order to secure the social and economic legislation necessary to protect disadvantaged persons and groups in our modern industrial society. He became active in the progressive movement in the 1920's. He took a prominent part in the LaFollette-Wheeler, third party campaign in 1924 and became a close friend of the LaFollettes, father and sons, of Senator Wheeler and Senator Norris. And in nearly every presidential campaign thereafter he was active in organizing an independent committee of liberals to support the more liberal candidates of the two parties.

I think it was Justice, then professor, Felix Frankfurter who first suggested to Harry Hopkins that David Niles belonged in the New Deal in Washington. David first worked as a personal assistant to Harry Hopkins, then to President Roosevelt and then to President Truman—concerning himself principally with the problems of the disadvantaged and minority groups.

In these positions David worked quietly for years in Washington. He had a real passion for anonymity, not being concerned with receiving public credit for what he did do and not troubling to deny blame attributed to him for what others did.

His years with President Truman were particularly productive. He gave significant assistance to President Truman in organizing and establishing in December 1946 the President's Committee on Civil Rights. It was the report of this Committee which gave great impetus to the movement for effective Federal civil rights legislation in the United States in the last decade. But nothing gave David Niles quite so much satisfaction, I am sure, as his work with President Truman on the Palestine problem. President Truman was deeply affected by the plight of the Jewish refugees in Europe at the close of the war and he turned to David for advice and assistance. President Truman discovered that the majority of the refugees wanted to go to Palestine and he was determined to help them get there.

I cannot tell you all the things David Niles did or did not do during the critical period of the Anglo-American Inquiry, the partition plan in the United Nations, and the subsequent struggle of the Jews in Palestine to gain their independence and to establish the State of Israel—because I do not know. But I do know that there were great and honest differences of opinion within the American Government and feelings ran high among those opposed to the establishment of the State and those in favor of it. There were those who suggested David was bringing political pressure on the State Department as if control of foreign policy in a democracy through the President and the Congress was unwarranted political pressure. But I feel confident when all the records are disclosed and all passion is spent it will be revealed that the greatest service David Niles rendered was to keep the President fully informed as to how his policies and directives were being carried out in the various departments of government so that the President could knowingly exercise his constitutional responsibilities. David performed this delicate and difficult task with great ability and skill. For this task conscientiously and faithfully performed we should gratefully honor his memory.

When I informed Mr. Truman I was to give the first David Niles Memorial Lecture here, he wrote me as follows:

"I was very fond of Dave Niles and I trusted him as I did few men."

"If there ever lived a man dedicated to the cause and plight of the abused, persecuted,

and oppressed, it was Dave Niles. His concern for these people was mirrored in his face—a face I will always remember for its solemn sadness and compassion.

"Yours sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN."

In view of David Niles' great interest in the United Nations as he watched the development of the United Nations Palestine partition plan, I thought it would be appropriate for me to take as the subject of the first David Niles memorial lecture—"The United Nations in Its 20th Year." As I shall be particularly concerned with some developments and trends which in my view threaten to undermine the first and primary purpose of the United Nations—that is to maintain international peace and security—I do not want you to think that I am unaware of the great difficulties with which the United Nations has had to contend and the considerable progress it has made in many spheres of its activities.

When the charter was drafted it was contemplated that the Great Powers would work out an acceptable peace which the United Nations could maintain. But a stable and acceptable peace—a consensus or modicum of common understanding on the basic principles of coexistence—was never established after the last world war. The Great Powers were in no position to cooperate to maintain a peace the terms of which they were unable to agree upon. Rivalry and conflict among the Great Powers led to a cold war in which the adversaries lost sight of their common interest in peace and were prone to exploit their differences rather than to attempt to find means of composing them. Even apart from the cold war the whole world was struggling to adjust itself to revolutionary political, economic and social changes, and the adjustment in many areas was difficult, painful, and not altogether rational. There was widespread need of adjustment to the radically changed conditions of life which modern science and technology made possible. In many areas the striving for economic improvement was accompanied by movements to break the bonds of colonial rule and feudal and tribal relationships. The very survival of the United Nations under these circumstances attests to humanity's essential need of the United Nations as an instrument of international cooperation in a world which has become increasingly interdependent despite ideological national and cultural differences and outlooks.

It is amazing the number of international institutions which have been created in the last two decades within the framework of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to meet the varied needs of states and their people. There is not only the United Nations but UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, GATT, the several regional U.N. economic commissions, the expanded program of technical assistance, the Special Fund, the Trade and Development Conference, and many more. In the modern world all states have felt the need in various ways of participating in cooperative international activities, and international cooperation is becoming the norm in many spheres of activities.

Technology has broken down the barriers of time and distance. New vistas bring new opportunities but new dangers. For good or ill, states cannot avoid multiple contacts with the outside world and increasing organization on an international basis is necessary to avoid conflict and promote common welfare. This is particularly true in the case of states emerging from colonial status. There can be no revolution of rising expectations in these underdeveloped lands without access to the tools and know-how of modern science and technology. To have such access, colonialism must not give way to a narrow

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

8473

isolationism with its turbulent nationalism or resurgent tribalism, but must be succeeded by enlightened international cooperation. Continued progress in the substitution of international cooperation for the old colonial relationship will be necessary in the years ahead for the common welfare of the people of the old as well as new states.

International cooperation within the general framework of the United Nations during the past 20 years has been much more widespread than it was within the framework of the League of Nations between the First and Second World Wars. This is an important measure due to the participation of the United States in these activities in contrast with its nonparticipation in most of the League's activities. The United Nations has aspired to a universality which was denied to the League because of America's absence. But it is important to remember that the universality to which the United Nations aspires is seriously threatened by the absence of representation of the mainland of China in United Nations' activities.

Without going into detail I think I have said enough to indicate that I am not unmindful of the growth and progress of many international activities within the framework of the United Nations during the last 20 years. But the many useful activities of the United Nations should not blind us to its faltering and disappointing progress in the fulfillment of its primary objective.

* * * * *

While there may have been doubts and misgivings as to how the primary objective of the charter was to be achieved there was and can be no doubt what the primary objective of the charter was and is. It is not necessary to recite at length the purposes and principles of the charter as enumerated in articles 1 and 2 and as embellished in the preamble. Paragraph 1 of article 1 states the first and primary objective of the charter—"to maintain international peace and security." All of the other stated purposes and principles of the charter are designed to strengthen and safeguard the primary purpose of maintaining peace among nations.

One should, of course, avoid making dogmatic judgments about bypassing the United Nations. The United Nations is not a totalitarian institution. The charter does not require that all international acts and transactions be done in or through the United Nations. The charter expressly contemplates that parties to a dispute which may endanger the peace should, first of all, seek a solution by peaceful means of their own choosing. But the charter provides no excuse for member states, large or small, keeping disputes for which no peaceful solution has been found away from the United Nations until they have actually erupted into war.

The basic law on which the charter was constructed is simple. It imposes no strait-jacket, no impossible burden or restriction on any state. It is based on principles by which all nations, large as well as small, must live if mankind is long to survive on this planet in this nuclear age. The law of the charter which all members are pledged to observe is twofold. First it requires all states, large as well as small, to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force except in individual or collective self-defense against armed attack, and all measures taken in the exercise of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council. Second, the charter required all states, large and small, to settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that peace, security, and justice are not endangered.

These two obligations of the charter are correlative. The surrender of the right of states to use force was not intended to leave states without any effective means of securing a redress of their grievances. A

state which resorts to force to redress its grievances without first invoking the processes of the United Nations violates the charter. But a state which refuses to consider the serious grievance of a sister state and refuses to agree to any procedure for peaceful settlement also violates the law of the charter. Force is proscribed as a means of settlement but members must be willing to negotiate and submit their disputes for settlement under some reasonable procedure. While the primary purpose of the United Nations must be to maintain peace, peace cannot be maintained without some minimum redress of genuine grievances. This twofold law of the charter constitutes the heart of the charter. The law of the charter provides the minimum requirements necessary to enable members to work together to outlaw the use of force as a means of settling international disputes and to provide procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes which threaten the peace.

There have always been questions and doubts how the United Nations could enforce the obligations of the charter against recalcitrant states, particularly the great powers. But there can be no question that the great powers as well as the small powers obligated themselves to observe the law of the charter. The veto may have given the great powers the right to forestall Security Council action, it did not give them the right to deny their obligation under the charter to respect the law of the charter. The "Uniting for Peace Resolution" of 1950 formally recognized the right of the Assembly to recommend action based on the obligations of the great powers as well as the small powers to observe the law of the charter.

In the early days of the charter the Soviet Union withdrew its troops from Iran, and France withdrew its troops from Syria to avoid charges of charter violation. In the early days of the charter it was assumed that if there was a threat to or breach of international peace, the United Nations would in one way or other be activated in an effort to stop the fighting and to restore peace. The U.N. may have been an imperfect instrument but it did help to restore peace in Greece, Kashmir and Korea. It also helped to restore peace in Israel when the State of Israel was first established and again at the time of the Suez difficulties even though the one-sided character of some of the Assembly's resolutions in the latter case may have been unfortunate and unwarranted.

Professions of faith in the United Nations and the law of the charter continue to be made in their formal addresses by heads of states and governments. But there has been a perceptible decline in the recognition and observance of the law of the charter, in the obligation to seek peaceful settlement or containment of disputes through the United Nations before using or threatening to use force to resolve them. There are, to be sure, explanations for these adverse developments—ideological differences between the east and the west and marked contrast in social and economic conditions between the north and the south. These would be sufficient explanations for nations trying to settle their disputes peacefully when they could without burdening the United Nations with their troubles. But these are scarcely justification for nations taking the law into their own hands and threatening to use and actually using force without first submitting the case to and seeking the good offices of the United Nations to obtain a redress of their grievances.

It is said, however, that the United Nations cannot take care of its present burdens and is in no position to assume more. Feigned concern for the United Nations is no excuse for any member violating the law of the charter without even attempting to fulfill its obligations under the charter. If

a member in good faith seeks the assistance of the United Nations to obtain a redress of its grievances against another state and the United Nations is, in fact, unable to act, it may then possibly be urged that there is a hiatus in the charter that would relieve the aggrieved state of its obligation not to take the law into its own hands. But charter obligations become illusory and the charter, as the last best hope of peace on earth, becomes a dying hope if member states resort to war for the settlement of their differences without first at least invoking the good offices of the United Nations. Bypassing the United Nations under such circumstances, I fear, evinces more contempt than concern for the future of the United Nations.

During the last decade or so, states have with disturbing frequency resorted to force or the threat of force without feeling even a sense of obligation of reporting their action in advance or even subsequently to the United Nations. One need only mention Russia in the case of Hungary, India in the case of Goa, and the United States in significant aspects of the Cuban and South Vietnam situations. I mention these instances not to single out a few states but to indicate the generality of the nonobservance.

Some authorities have tried to justify the evisceration of the law of the charter by a latitudinarian construction of the right of self-defense under article 51 and of the authority of regional agencies under articles 52 and 53. I fear many of these interpretations are based on opinions that the legal advisers are requested to render after, rather than before, the political decision to resort to force has been made by the responsible political officers. Some of the more latitudinarian constructions of the right of individual and collective self-defense seems to me to militate against the spirit of the charter which is to bring disputes to the United Nations before they erupt into war. Perhaps more important than the exact scope of the right of self-defense is the recognition that the right of self-defense, whatever it limits, affords no excuse for not bringing a dispute which threatens the peace of the United Nations for settlement before the right of self-defense is exercised if time permits and immediately thereafter if prior submission is not possible.

The rightful exercise of the right of self-defense, in my view, is no excuse for continuing to wage war without resort to the United Nations for peaceful settlement. Neither should the wrongful exercise of the right of self-defense, if discontinued at the request of the United Nations, deprive a member state of its right to secure a redress of its grievances as part of the United Nations processes of peaceful settlement.

In recent years there has also been an attempt to justify the evisceration of the law of the charter on the ground that the charter does not forbid the use of force by one state at the request of the recognized government of another state to assist the latter state to quell a rebellion. Such a libertarian construction of the charter does violence to the letter and spirit of the charter. The armed intervention of one state in the civil war of another state whether at the request of the established government or its rival government is in fact the use of force by the intervening states in its international relations, whether the civil war be called a war of liberation or a war in defense of freedom.

True the charter does not forbid civil war or deny the right to revolt. But it does not sanction the right of an outside state to participate in another's state civil war. If a civil war in one state threatens international peace the United Nations may intervene to deal with that threat, but no member state on its own responsibility has the right to participate in the fighting in another state's civil war. If different states

recognize opposing factions in a civil war and participate in the fighting with opposing factions, they create and do not prevent a threat to international peace. Events in Europe in connection with the Spanish Civil War made this obvious. This does not mean that arms may not be shipped to a friendly state threatened with rebellion; or that troops may not be sent to a friendly state to participate in a collective self-defense action to repel an armed attack from another state; or that troops may not be dispatched to a friendly state to participate in a mission of mercy to prevent the massacre of innocent civilians. But taking sides and fighting in another state's civil war is quite a different matter. See, Cohen, "The United Nations, Constitutional Developments, Growth, and Possibilities," Harvard University Press, 1961, pages 53-54.

It serves little purpose to debate the legal soundness of some of the interpretations given the charter under the impact of political forces. A recent study of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace ("The OAS, the U.N. and the United States," by Inis L. Claude, Jr., International Conciliation No. 547, March 1964) demonstrates how under the impact of the cold war the U.S. Government has come close to shifting its legal position completely on the relations between the United Nations and regional agencies. There is a sort of Gresham's law operating in the field of charter interpretation. No state can or will long operate under a rule of law that is not respected by its fellow states. A restatement of the rule may fare no better unless there is a change in the political environment and the forces which shape the decisions of the responsible political officers of the state. I do not agree with many international lawyers and teachers who would like to have the Legal Committee have a monopoly on the legal questions arising under the charter in the General Assembly. I think it important that the highest political officers have a realistic understanding of the meaning and effect of charter interpretations and not merely accept the advice of their legal experts pro forma when it does not matter, only to reject and ignore it when it really touches a vital political nerve.

But whatever the causes or explanations, the law of the charter which was to outlaw the use of force as a means of settling disputes between states has fallen into desuetude. If we continue to accept this abandonment of the basic law of the charter requiring all nations, large and small, to seek in good faith peaceful settlement through the processes of the United Nations before resorting to war, we shall have allowed the very heart to be torn from the charter. Important as are the technical and social services the United Nations may render the underdeveloped countries, these are but fringe benefits which will wither away once the heart of the United Nations ceases to beat.

* * * * *

What has gone wrong? Is it the fault of the charter? Is it due to the veto? Is it due to the excessive voting power of the small new states in the Assembly? Have we really exhausted the untried resources and potentialities of the charter?

The charter may not be perfect. But it is not the charter that obstructs the way to peace. The charter sets forth a few basic principles but leaves to successive generations who will live under it the responsibility of finding suitable means of carrying out those principles. The charter is not a self-operating mechanism. Its operation depends not so much on the words of the charter as on the way member states exercise their rights and meet their responsibilities. Some means are specified in the charter but these are not necessarily exclusive. Within

widest limits other means are not prohibited. The charter is not a code of civil procedure to be strictly construed. I know no better canon of construction to be used in determining charter power than that laid down by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheaton 316, 421, for determining constitutional power: "Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

It is the right and responsibility of member states to find means which are appropriate, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the charter, to carry out purposes of the charter. There has been a tendency, I fear, for members to seek excuses and alibis for not working under the charter rather than to make any sustained efforts to find means of carrying out the purposes of the charter. It is quite possible that the means which may prove most helpful now are not necessarily the means which would have been most helpful in years past or the means which may be most helpful in the more distant future.

It seems to me that we have tried to build the United Nations too much in the image of the nation state—to muster power to fight wars rather than to develop the tolerance and understanding to prevent war. We have tried to exorcise differences by a majority vote rather than to seek means of composing and reconciling differences and containing, within reasonable, tolerable, and livable limits, those which cannot presently be composed or reconciled.

Of course until there is much greater progress toward general and effectively safeguarded disarmament it is necessary and in the interest of the United Nations and world peace that the member states maintain a reasonable balance of armed strength so that the most aggressive states will not be tempted to secure their interests by war rather than peaceful means. Of course it is in the interest of the United Nations and world peace that member states cooperate not only in the United Nations but in regional and functional organizations so that they will be better able to support the efforts of the United Nations to maintain peace in the world. We live in a pluralistic world and diverse and varied efforts—political, economic and social within and without the United Nations—are needed to strengthen the forces of peace, freedom and well-being throughout the world, provided however that such efforts do not countenance the waging of war in disregard of the United Nations Charter.

In this divided world in this nuclear age there is no substitute for an organization like the United Nations which transcends the interests of states and groups of states and sets above their divergent interests the common interest and the transcending vital interest of all states in the maintenance of peace.

Military alliances may deter war for a period by maintaining an uneasy balance of power, but military alliances are not likely to develop means or procedures for peaceful settlement or containment of vital differences among states or groups of states parties to different alliances. NATO, SEATO, and CENTO were to function in support of the United Nations and its charter principles, but in fact there has been little or no effort to relate their work to the United Nations. Many supporters of NATO, the greatest of the postwar military alliances, would give it priority over the United Nations. Yet NATO has not been able to secure peaceful settlement in its own area; it reluctantly acquiesced in the United Nations intervention in Cyprus when all else failed. NATO has in no way responded to the de-

tente with the Soviet Union with any arms control proposals. Indeed it has tended to regard with suspicion any arms control proposals which would affect it. At the time of the 1961 Berlin crisis, NATO was used not in support of the U.N. and peaceful settlement but as an alternative to resort to the United Nations. When crises developed in Laos and South Vietnam, SEATO was invoked not in support of the U.N. and peaceful settlement but in lieu of the United Nations.

If one believes in the therapeutic effects of shock treatment in international affairs, in the therapeutic value of periodic armed confrontations such as occurred in Berlin, Cuba, and Vietnam, one need not be concerned by the fading out of the United Nations and what was once called man's last best hope of peace on earth. But such confrontations in this nuclear age involve risks which responsible statesmen conscious of their responsibilities to future generations cannot continue to ignore.

The United Nations was established to enable responsible statesmen to work together to avoid these risks. It was intended to provide an instrumentality through which members could unite their power and resources, spiritual and material, to protect their one and all-important common interest in the maintenance of peace in this nuclear age. Of course the charter will fail of its purposes if states insist on using force or the threat of force when it suits their interests without giving the United Nations the chance to use its good offices to compose differences which threaten the peace.

It is not the lack of power which might be called to the support of the United Nations which stands in the way of the realization of the promise of the United Nations. It is the lack of genuine effort on the part of the member states particularly the great powers, to use the as yet untapped resources of the United Nations to develop processes and procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes among states. It is putting the cart before the horse, to put it mildly, to worry about how the United Nations is going to muster power to enforce peaceful settlement before it has developed processes and procedures for reaching peaceful settlements which can command the respect of states whose vital interests and possibly very existence are at stake. Intemperate invective and unrestrained cold war debate hastily followed by the counting of votes, in many instances uninformed and unaffected by the facts or merits of the controversy, constitute a rank betrayal of the purposes and principles of the charter.

It is extraordinary that so little sustained thought and consideration has been given to the development of the processes of conciliation and mediation as part of the pacific settlement functions of the United Nations. The sidetracking and soft-pedaling of the pacific settlement functions of the United Nations may be ascribed in large part, as I have indicated, to the cold war. Issues formally brought to the United Nations for peaceful settlement have been exploited for propaganda purposes and serious efforts to harmonize differences have been noticeable by their absence. The mediation and conciliation functions of the United Nations have been neglected and allowed to atrophy. Obviously in dealing with differences among sovereign states, particularly at this stage of international organization when states are excessively jealous of their sovereignty, an agreed solution is to be preferred to an imposed solution. Even states eager for a solution are loath to agree in advance to accept arbitration or an imposed solution for fear, sometimes for groundless fear, it may involve unexpected terms difficult or impossible to explain to their people. The imposition of a solution may produce serious divisions and strains within the United Nations, while an agreed solution, if

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8475

can be brought about, is an undisputed achievement and builds international confidence in the United Nations. The process of conciliation and mediation encourages good faith negotiations and collective bargaining among states. It tends to curb the instinctive habits of states when national passions are aroused to try to get their way by threats and counterthreats of force instead of seeking a fair accommodation by a little give-and-take on both sides. There is indeed at this stage of international organization perhaps more to learn from the traditions and practices which govern the peaceful settlement of labor disputes in modern industrial states than there is from the study of the making and enforcement of law within a state. In the early days of labor unions there seemed to be irreconcilable differences in the ideology of labor and capital, and the law in many states did not even recognize the right of labor to organize. Labor did not trust the courts, which labor felt shared the ideas of management. To paraphrase the remarks of Mr. Litvinov regarding the relations of capitalism and communism, labor thought no one could be neutral between management and labor. In the early days of union activities violence on one side or the other or both—allegedly in self-defense, of course—was not uncommon. Gradually the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively was recognized by law, but both sides shied away from compulsory arbitration unless it was agreed to in advance by both sides. But custom, if not law, imposed upon both sides the duty to bargain in good faith and make every effort to reach a peaceful agreement. If prolonged work stoppage threatens the welfare of the community it has become customary for the state or community to intervene, not by imposing a settlement but by creating an environment which should facilitate an agreed settlement. Sometimes the state or community will provide a cooling-off period comparable to a waiting period of 3 months following the report of the Council, which, under the covenant of the League, states agreed to observe before resorting to war. Sometimes the state or community will provide a cease-fire during which negotiations can proceed in a relaxed atmosphere. Frequently the state or community will provide a mediator or conciliator, or a group of mediators or conciliators. These skilled professionals will bring the parties together, find the essential facts at the root of the controversy, define and narrow issues, isolate and defer issues on which agreement is clearly impossible, suggest alternative solutions, and at times make definite recommendations for settlement that they think both sides can accept and live with.

It might be said that in the labor relations field an unwritten common law has been developed and accepted that all disputes affecting the public welfare must be settled peacefully; that is, without violence and without protracted disruption of the public service. No particular means of reaching a settlement is prescribed, but all means cannot be rejected. Mediation and conciliation processes will be available to assist the parties reach an agreement by means of their own choice, and compulsory arbitration will be avoided as long as possible. But an agreed settlement or modus vivendi must be reached or the parties will be obliged to accept an imposed settlement.

Much of what has been learned in the last century in the handling of labor-management disputes can be applied in the handling of disputes among states. We should worry less about the power of the United Nations to compel or coerce settlement and concern ourselves more with the conciliation and mediation procedures and processes the United Nations can provide to assist states

compose their differences and settle their disputes. The United Nations environment should be most favorable to the development of unparalleled facilities for conciliation and mediation. Most member states, with little or no direct interest in a direct dispute unless prematurely forced to take sides, will naturally want to be helpful in facilitating an agreed settlement by peaceful means. Most disputes between states like most disputes between labor and management involve other legal issues and cannot be settled by the application of any preexisting or mutually acceptable rule of law. Consequently they lend themselves more readily to negotiated settlements than to inflexible judicial settlements of political legislative solutions. The disputant states, like labor-management disputants, are less likely to fear outside intervention to facilitate a negotiated settlement than they are to fear outside intervention to impose or coerce a settlement.

Indeed despite the neglect of the pacific settlement functions of the United Nations and the lack of preparations to enable the United Nations to function effectively in this area, there is enough in the past activities of the United Nations to justify faith in the great potentialities of the United Nations in this area. There are the outstanding accomplishments of Count Bernadotte and Dr. Ralph Bunche as mediators in the Israeli-Arab conflict in 1948; the quick and extraordinary resourcefulness and imaginative statesmanship of Mr. Lester Pearson of Canada which led to the creation over a weekend in 1956 of a peacekeeping force not to fight but to keep the peace in the most sensitive areas in the Near East; the patience of Mr. Frank Graham in containing the Kashmir conflict; the deft and dedicated efforts of Dag Hammarskjold in handling the operations of the United Nations peacekeeping forces in the Near East and later in the Congo; and similar efforts of U Thant in the tense Cyprus situation.

Indeed it is interesting to contrast the failure of member states to earmark troops, by special agreements with the Security Council under article 43 of the charter or in response to the Collective Measures Committee of the General Assembly, for enforcement or sanction actions with the increasing willingness of member states to earmark troops for peacekeeping operations as an adjunct to pacific settlement. Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iran, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden and most recently the United Kingdom have already volunteered to hold troops on a permanent basis in readiness for United Nations peacekeeping operations. (Issues before the 19th General Assembly, International Conciliation, No. 550 November 1964, pp. 19-24.)

These are significant stirrings of hope. Yet one must regretfully observe that most national statesmen—while paying lip-service to the United Nations and tearfully lamenting its ineffectiveness and professing to wish to see it strengthened—have done precious little to develop and dramatize the great potentialities of the United Nations under the present charter in the field of peacekeeping and pacific settlement. If, as they tell us, there is no alternative to peace in this nuclear age, they should give at least a fraction of the time they give to building up military power to building up an effective administrative corps within the United Nations to assist and promote the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Certainly national statesmen might be expected to give us much time to this task as they give to the recently revived study of geopolitics which seems to be based on the supposedly obsolete theory that there is no alternative to war.

I will make only a few of many suggestions which should be worthy of study in this con-

nexion. One, there should be set up a reporting or rapporteur system to assist the Security Council and the General Assembly in handling disputes between states which threaten the peace. Every precaution should be taken to relieve the Security Council and the Assembly from having to act on the uncorroborated statements of the disputants and their partisans. There should be available to these organs reports—prepared by a professional rapporteur or group of rapporteurs—as objective as possible of the essential facts at issue and the positions taken by the disputants.

Second, as part of or in addition to such a corps of rapporteurs, there should be small corps of professional diplomats whose experience or training qualify them to act as mediators or conciliators. Among other things, it should be their duty to investigate on their own initiative or on the request of a specified number of member states the use of force or the threat to use force by any state or states which has not been brought to the attention of the United Nations and to report the essential facts to the Secretary General. The Secretary General should be authorized on the basis of such report to offer the services of the mediating and conciliating corps to the disputants to assist them in negotiating a settlement of their differences.

* * * * *

It is gravely disturbing that many devoted friends of the United Nations have failed to grasp that the failure of the United Nations is threatened as much or more by the neglect of the great powers than by the irresponsibility of the small states. Even the revered Dag Hammarskjold who gave his life for the United Nations, in appealing for the support of the small states against Mr. Khrushchev's proposal to force his resignation and to trifurcate the office of the Secretary General, stated in the General Assembly in September 1961: "It is not the Soviet Union or indeed, any other big powers, who need the U.N. for their protection; it is all the others. In this sense, the Organization is first of all their organization, and I deeply believe in the wisdom with which they will be able to use it and guide it." It is quite understandable at that critical time Hammarskjold should have reminded the small states of their great stake in the United Nations and their duty to act responsibly. It was unfortunate, however, that the words may suggest that the great powers have a lesser stake in and a lesser need of the U.N. If great powers do not sense their imperative need of the United Nations to preserve the peace, they will not give the United Nations the support necessary for its growth and survival. If the great powers do not have confidence in the United Nations, they cannot expect the smaller powers to have confidence in it.

Recurrently and persistently a school of realists tell us that the United States cannot deal with conflicts between the great powers because of the veto and the lack of countervailing power. One would have thought that the uniting for peace resolution in 1950 would have put that argument to rest. Moreover, whatever criticism may be made of the one-sidedness of some of the resolutions in the Suez case, it certainly established the continued vitality of the uniting for peace resolution and rejected the proposition that the great powers have a right to ignore their charter obligations. Strong arguments may be advanced that the United Nations cannot muster the power, and would be unwise to attempt, to impose its will by force on the great powers or for that matter on some of the lesser powers. The primary purpose of the United Nations after all is to keep the peace and prevent war, not to fight wars, to stop aggression not to pun-

ish the aggressor. But there is nothing in the charter or outside the charter that would justify the great powers any more than the small powers to reject and ignore the conciliation, mediation, and other peace-keeping processes and procedures that the United Nations might provide for the peaceful settlement of disputes which threaten the peace. If the United Nations withers away, it will not be because it lacks the power to impose its will by force but because the forces for peace represented in the United Nations do not unite their strength as the charter bids them to do to bring the powers, great or small, which are involved in the conflict, to the conference table for good faith negotiation. I have scant sympathy with those who are so devoted to the United Nations that they would not saddle it with the burdensome task of bringing clashing powers to the conference table for fear the conference will be abortive. To what a pass the United Nations has come when it scarcely takes notice of a war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a major world conflict.

It is not suggested that disputes affecting the vital interests and very existence of states may peacefully be settled by cold war debate and the counting of partisan votes. On this greatly diversified and deeply divided world, a consensus is not easily found. But even amid diversity and division the common interest in peace—in the continuation of life itself on this planet—should be strong and effective enough to provide the procedures and processes to bring states in conflict to the conference table and to assist them to reach agreed settlements with which they can live.

This does not mean that all debate in the General Assembly and Security Council can or should be suppressed. As in all political bodies the delegates often speak as much to their own constituents as to their fellow delegates. To some extent this is unavoidable and with limits desirable. It does enable the delegates to inform and advise one another of the grievances, problems, and predilections of their various constituencies. But the cold war has unfortunately invaded the United Nations and taken over to the point that in some instances it has strengthened and accentuated divisions and actually militated against the development of a feeling of community, of shared interests in meeting the problems and adjusting the differences which threaten not only peace but life on this planet.

If the political organs of the United Nations are to play their part in building peace which will save the world from a nuclear holocaust, there must be when there is no clear consensus, a downgrading of voting and an upgrading of efforts to create and employ the processes of mediation and conciliation to obtain the accommodations, compromises, and provisional arrangements which are necessary if we are to live at peace. But there are those who say let justice and right prevail though the heavens fall. But who is to determine what is just and what is right. Does justice lie with the strongest battalions or the deadliest missiles? And what justice can there be if the heavens fall. I should think it might better be said: Let justice be done so that the heavens will not fall.

Antagonistic ideologies not reconcilable by logic have in the past been reconciled by the felt necessities of the times, even when they contended not only for the things of this earth but for man's immortal soul. The test of life, the test of peaceful coexistence—like the test of law as Justice Holmes has reminded us—is not logic but experience. Slowly and surely the most hardheaded statesman barring lapses in periods of tension and passion are coming to realize that war no longer is a practical way of adjusting international disputes.

What are some of the working rules which should be observed in the United Nations in order to make the most effective use of the processes of conciliation in the settlement of international disputes which threaten the peace? They conform very closely with those which have proved effective in the conciliation and mediation of labor disputes. Impartial rapporteurs and skilled mediators should objectively try to ascertain the essential facts and to determine the extent to which they may be in dispute; to ascertain and define the essential issues which divide the disputants so as to reduce, narrow and contain them to the greatest possible extent. They should also suggest alternative solutions to compose those differences which seem reconcilable with a little give and take, and should suggest provisional and ad hoc arrangements to circumvent or contain within tolerable and livable limits vital issues on which the parties are presently irreconcilably divided. This generation must be wise enough to find ways of leaving to the solvent of time and the wisdom of succeeding generations problems which this generation is unable to solve. If this generation does not find and accept such ways there may be no tomorrow. Let us not forget that the most aggressive ideologies undergo changes over the years. Even the most fanatical faiths balk at self-destruction and mellow with time. When men realize as Justice Holmes so eloquently stated that "time has upset many fighting faiths" (*Abrams v. U.S.*, 250 U.S. 616, 630) and when men realize that time has brought many unexpected changes even in our lifetime, we should have faith that the next generation may be able to solve the problems we are unable to solve. At least we should do our best to give the next generation a chance.

* * * * *

Let us now take a look at the none too successful efforts at mediation and conciliation in the recent ill-fated 19th General Assembly centering about the application of article 19 of the charter to the Soviet Union. Article 19 provides that a member 2 years in arrears shall have no vote in the General Assembly, although the General Assembly may permit it to vote if it is satisfied that failure to pay is due to conditions beyond its control. It was contended by the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada that the Soviet Union was more than 2 years in arrears because of its failure to meet the General Assembly's assessments against it for the UNEF (United Nations Emergency Force) peacekeeping in the Middle East and for ONUC (United Nation's Operations in the Congo) peacekeeping. The International Court of Justice in an advisory opinion on which its members were sharply divided, nine to five, had found the assessments for UNEF and ONUC valid and binding under the charter. The General Assembly after acrimonious debate in its 18th session had voted to accept the opinion. The Soviet Union and France have taken the position that only the Security Council under the charter can impose binding obligations, although France supported the uniting for peace resolution in 1950 and met her contributions to UNEF voluntarily. The Soviet Union had initially supported the peacekeeping operation for the Congo in the Security Council, although it withdrew its support after Lumumba's ouster.

It is the contention of the Soviet Union that it is not in arrears, and that neither the Court's advisory opinion or the resolution of the General Assembly can impose an obligation to pay for peacekeeping not authorized by the Security Council. France which during 1965 will similarly become in arrears because of her nonpayment of the Congo assessments supports the Soviet contention. It should be observed that both UNEF and ONUC were financed partly by a modified

scale of assessments and partly by voluntary contributions. All subsequent peace-keeping operations have been financed by voluntary contribution.

The United States, the United Kingdom and Canada have taken the position that the General Assembly has accepted the Court's opinion, that the President of the Assembly must automatically apply article 19 and deny the Soviet Union the right to vote. They further contend that on point of order the ruling should stand and would be sustained by simple majority vote. Other members take the position that article 19 must be read in connection with article 18 which provides that the suspension of rights and privilege should be considered important question requiring a two-thirds vote.

The President of the Assembly and the Secretary General tried from November to February to mediate the dispute. They succeeded in quieting considerably the usual cold war debate and in avoiding a tabulated vote save on the final motion to adjourn in order to prevent a direct confrontation not of arms but of wills between the Soviet Union and the United States which might lead to the breakup of the United Nations.

Conciliation efforts have not succeeded but they have not finally failed. It seems a pity that in a period of detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, it was not possible to find practical means and measures of meeting the United Nation's deficit so that the Assembly could get on with its work without being bogged down in legalisms. With a little give and take a practical settlement might have been reached without resolving the controversial legal issues which have been unduly and unnecessarily exploited. Neither the Court's advisory opinion nor article 19 need stand in the way of a practical settlement. To reach a practical settlement it is not necessary to accept or reject the Court's opinion.

It is important to recall just what the Court did and did not advise: Not that the General Assembly may not finance peacekeeping by voluntary contributions, indeed both UNEF and ONUC are partially financed by voluntary contributions; Not that the General Assembly may not authorize States particularly interested to assume the preponderant burden as was the case in Korea and later in Cyprus and Yemen. The Court merely advised that the General Assembly had the charter power, and had exercised it in the case of UNEF and ONUC, to impose obligatory assessments to defray the costs of peacekeeping.

But the Court did not decide that at this stage of international organization in the world where states are still inordinately jealous of their sovereignty that it was wise statesmanship to finance peacekeeping on the basis of obligatory assessments. A political body whose powers are essentially recommendatory should hesitate, particularly in the absence of Great Power unity and an overwhelming consensus, to require sovereign states to finance actions which they oppose and which they cannot be required to participate in or assist directly. It is frequently asserted that the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations will not be undertaken if there is no power of obligatory assessment. I doubt this. Peacekeeping will not and should not be authorized unless the States supporting such action are willing to support or to find support for it. Obviously much of the social and economic work of United Nations and its specialized agencies could not and would not be carried out on other than an essentially voluntary basis.

It is no accident that both the United States and United Kingdom last summer (1964) proposed to the Working Group of the Assembly, which was studying methods for financing peacekeeping operations involving heavy expenditures, a special pro-

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8477

edure for handling such financing in the General Assembly. They joined in proposing that in the future in apportioning expenses for peacekeeping operations the General Assembly acts only on the recommendation of a special finance committee which should include the permanent members of the Security Council and a relatively high percentage of member states in each geographical area that are large financial contributors to the United Nations. They further proposed that such recommendation be made only on a two-thirds vote of the committee membership. (U.N. Doc. A/AC 113/30, Sept. 14, 1964.) These proposals, I am sure, are designed not simply to offer some protection in the future to the Soviet Union but to other large contributors including the United States and the United Kingdom against being assessed for operations which they oppose and in which they cannot be forced to participate directly. At this stage of international organization, it is neither wise statesmanship nor practical politics to expect states to be able to get substantial appropriations from their national legislatures to finance international operations to which they are opposed. At this stage of international organization states must learn to cooperate voluntarily before they seek to enforce cooperation from recalcitrant states.

The long period of watchful waiting during which the 19th Assembly did nothing, clearly indicates that the member states do not want the future of the organization to depend upon whether the application of article 19 to the Soviet Union under the present state of accounts is or is not automatic. They do not want to offend the United States which has been the financial mainstay of the United Nations and the political champion of its expanding role in world affairs. On the other hand they recognize that the United Nations cannot be a worldwide organization for peace if the Soviet Union is to be deprived of its vote. The members do not want the United Nations to be stalled in its tracks. They want to find a way to get on with its work.

Had a way not been found to adjourn the Assembly until next September (1965), the President of the Assembly would undoubtedly have refrained from ruling on his own responsibility on the automatic application of article 19. He would undoubtedly have asked the advice of the member states. They also would have sought a way to avoid making a decision on application of article 19. It need be a majority might have voted to make this an important question requiring a two-thirds vote under article 18(3). In that case it would have been unlikely that any decision could command a two-thirds vote and efforts to find an accommodation or compromise would have had to be resumed.

A new Committee of 33 has been established by the Assembly and is instructed in consultation with the President and Secretary General to review the whole question of peacekeeping operations, including ways of overcoming the present financial difficulties of the organization and report by June 15 (1965). It is to be hoped that during the adjournment the Committee of 33 will find a way out of the morass. It really should not be difficult if the Committee recognizes its job is to break the deadlock and not to vindicate a theory. The legal questions need not stand in the way of an acceptable and workable accommodation. The Committee need not question the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. It need not decide whether the application of article 19 is or is not automatic. The Committee might well recommend that, in light of the practical difficulties encountered which have paralyzed the work of the 19th session, the

Assembly should reconsider the nature of the assessments levied for UNEF and ONUC. It might suggest that without prejudice to its charter powers and without prejudice to the advisory opinion of the Court, the Assembly should declare the assessments to be recommendatory and nonmandatory while urging all states to meet their share of such assessments. The states which voted for these assessments should naturally feel morally bound to meet their share. Should some states fail to meet their quota, for reasons which to them seem compelling, they should be urged to contribute a substantially equivalent amount to other operations of the United Nations so that the overall costs of the United Nations may be equitably shared by its members. Should there remain a deficit in meeting the costs of UNEF and ONUC, a special appeal should be made for voluntary contributions to make up the deficit.

If the Assembly is prepared to recognize the unwise at this stage of international organization of attempting to make its assessments for special peacekeeping operations obligatory, there should be reason to hope that the Soviet Union and France would voluntarily meet their assessments or make substantially equivalent contributions to other essential activities of the United Nations. In the absence of special circumstances, States which do not contribute to special peacekeeping operations should not be entitled to a voice in the administration of such operations. Of course it may be a bit messy to reconsider the mandatory character of a partially executed plan of assessments. But it is better to offend the purists than to let the Assembly be stalemated or blackout indefinitely.

It is to be regretted, as I have indicated, that in a period of relative detente between the West and the Soviet Union a negotiated settlement has been so difficult to achieve. It is particularly regrettable that the work of the Assembly should have been stalled over the financing of peacekeeping operations because it has been in the field of peacekeeping as an aid to peaceful settlement that the most promising developments in the United Nations in recent years have occurred. It was somewhat reassuring to note that the cold war debate was less acrimonious than usual and that the membership as a whole calmly exerted their influence to mediate the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union and to prevent a self-defeating confrontation over article 19. Despite the unsuccessful attempt of Albania to precipitate the confrontation, the many new, small and weak members acted with a sense of responsibility and restraint.

* * * * *

The admission of many new small states has created problems which cannot be ignored. But the seriousness of these problems can be greatly minimized if the larger states take the lead in developing practices and procedures which encourage and promote the use of the Assembly not as a forum for fighting cold wars, but for ending them.

With the admission of many new and relatively weak states it becomes theoretically possible for the General Assembly to vote for action for the carrying out of which the voting majority would shoulder little or no responsibility or burden. It must be remembered, however, that the action of the General Assembly is recommendatory and not mandatory. Its effectiveness must depend upon its appeal to the judgment and interests of states. Indeed, democratic states cannot be expected to assist actively in carrying out programs to which their people are strongly opposed. It must be recognized that voting in the Assembly on the basis of the sovereign equality of states does not automatically reflect world power, world wealth, or world wisdom. Member states

may be expected to give good faith consideration to the Assembly's recommendation, but they are not bound to act against their own better judgment nor to ignore the fact that a numerical majority may in some instances not be truly representative of informed world opinion.

When the cold war was at its height there was excessive emphasis on voting and a misguided attempt to exaggerate the significance of a mere numerical majority. At this stage of international organization a vote which requires action can become effective only if it moves to action states which have the will and power to act. A vote will command respect not by the mere number of states back of it but by the worldwide feelings or sentiments it reflects, by the worldwide response or reaction to events it evokes, and by the influence it brings to bear on the actions of the states to which it is addressed. Many closely divided votes may only serve to strengthen divisions rather than to develop a consensus.

Small states cannot expect to dictate to the more powerful states what they must do. On the other hand small states also have their rights, and large states cannot claim the right to act in areas in which small states are concerned without explaining and justifying their action. As President Roosevelt stated in his last state of the Union message on January 6, 1946, when the charter of the United Nations was being drafted: "We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics any more than we can deny that power is a factor in national politics. But in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good." And the power of which President Roosevelt was speaking was power which was something more than transient military force.

For the United Nations to function effectively with its present membership at this stage of international organization, greater reliance must be placed on procedures for peaceful settlement through conciliatory processes. Less reliance should be placed on voting on volatile political issues which in the absence of a clear consensus cannot be resolved by a vote.

In emphasizing the flexibility of the charter and its adaptability to "exigencies"—to paraphrase the remarks of Justice Holmes in reference to the American Constitution, "which could not have been completely foreseen by the most gifted of its begetters"—I do not wish to rule out all charter amendments. I only warn that we must exploit the potentialities of the present charter in order to develop a broader and deeper feeling of worldwide community which must precede any meaningful charter change. As we broaden the areas of consensus, we increase the possibility of strengthening the charter by amendment.

Amendments to the charter enlarging the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council have been proposed by the 18th General Assembly. (Resolutions 1991 A and B (xviii) Dec. 17, 1963.) The Security Council amendment would enlarge the Security Council to 15 members. Of the 10 nonpermanent members, 5 would come from Africa and Asia, 1 from Eastern Europe, 2 from Latin America, and 2 from Western Europe and elsewhere. The Economic and Social Council amendment would enlarge ECOSOC to 27 members, of which 9 would be elected each year for 3-year terms. Seven of nine elected each year would come from Africa and Asia, one from Latin America, and one from Western Europe.

A larger Security Council and ECOSOC would appear desirable in order to reflect a broader spectrum of world opinion. But it would seem to me that if the Security Council is to be enlarged there should be provision to

April 28, 1965

insure that not less than one-third of its membership are drawn from a middle group of states which, while not among the original permanent members of the Council, are large financial contributors. This middle group might constitute a class of additional permanent members without power of veto or at least an additional class of members eligible for successive reelection. This middle group should include states like India, Japan, Brazil, Italy, Germany, and, possibly, Nigeria.

Moreover if the Security Council is to be enlarged in order to obtain a more balanced representation it would seem to be desirable if not necessary at the same time to provide for a better balanced distribution of voting power in the General Assembly. In light of the great disparity of power between the relatively small number of large States and the large number of small States some change in the distribution of voting power in the Assembly is important to maintain the influence of the General Assembly and to give meaning and power to its resolutions. It is likewise important to maintain the capacity of the Assembly to act responsibly—to represent power as well as numbers—when the veto forestalls action in the Security Council. But it is not easy to find any acceptable principle of weighted voting to impose on the principle of sovereign equality of states. A dual voting system perhaps affords the best way of reconciling the sovereign equality of states with a responsibly balanced power structure. It might conceivably be possible if and when the Great Powers consent to an enlarged and better balanced Security Council that the smaller powers would concurrently consent to a dual voting system in the General Assembly whereby ordinary resolutions in the General Assembly would require a double majority vote—a majority of all members and a majority of those states in the Assembly which are represented on the enlarged Security Council. Then important resolutions of the Assembly would require a two-thirds majority of the whole membership and a two-thirds majority of those states in the Assembly which are members of the Security Council. This is a form of weighted voting which avoids the need for weighing the votes of individual states. It should create a better relationship between the Security Council and the Assembly and at the same time increase the effective influence of the Assembly on the Security Council.

But desirable as some amendments may be, we must not let the obstacles in the way of attaining them blind us to the potentialities of the present charter which is and was designed to be adaptable to changing conditions and unforeseen exigencies. The means which may be most effective for carrying out the charter purposes when the Great Powers are working together may not be the most effective means when they are in conflict. The most effective means of carrying out the charter objectives at one stage in the growth of international organization may not be the most effective means at a different and more advanced stage. The charter is broad in scope and allows a wide measure of choice of means. It is for each generation to have the wisdom and imagination to choose the appropriate means and procedures for keeping the peace in its time.

At the present time the important thing is to find the means which enable the member states to cooperate to the maximum extent to keep the peace within the frame and law of the charter. The important thing is not to impose the will of a majority of states on a minority of states but to provide an environment and a procedure for composing or containing differences among states before they erupt into war. The peaceful settlement of disputes requires not armies but wisdom and vision. Long ago in the days of Solomon it was said that "Where there is no vision

the people perish." Let us hope that in this nuclear age vision is not lacking when without vision life on this planet may cease to exist.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR—THE BRACERO PROBLEM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in recent months, the Senate has been engaging in serious colloquy concerning the bracero problem of importing labor to harvest the crops.

A great many farmers, as the President knows, are presently in serious straits, wondering whether to plant their crops because of the absence of available labor.

The other day, out of the blue, I received a letter from a gentleman in New York who owns property in my State of Colorado, and in that letter he included a copy of his letter to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz.

The letter details the problems which farmers face in Colorado as well as in other parts of the country, and he includes some exhibits from his own tenant farmers in that area. I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am taking the liberty to forward to you a copy of a letter which I believe is self-explanatory in reference to the sugarbeet labor situation.

The situation is critical, and anything which you could do to help correct it in these next few days before planting time for the 1965 crop would be a godsend.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON D. BLAIR.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 5, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I doubt that you will remember me from the New York Beta of the Year Dinner at the Harvard Club May 15, 1963, but as a New York City banker of 40 years' experience and a third generation land-owner from the Plains of Colorado where I grew up knowing well and intimately the vicissitudes of struggle with nature, I want to impose on your time for a few minutes to urgently discuss a matter of economic survival for some of our most valuable citizens—the sugarbeet farmers.

The lapse of Public Law 78, and sudden prohibition of the hiring of Mexicans, who have worked our beets for some two generations, presents a crisis, not just a problem, and a very serious crisis. The use of "braceros" must be reinstated at once.

Farming at best is a great risk, and the beet farmers have been working valiantly under the guidance of the sugar companies to mechanize and dispense with hand labor. Much progress has been registered with the innovation of segmented seed and introduction of chemical weed eradicators, but nature cannot be changed over night as can be restrictive legislation. The substitute labor suggested is just not available for those farmers from a hundred to several hundred miles from congested cities with large relief populations. It is doubtful that those on relief would be efficient and effective on

farms, or would care to "go rural" for a month period. Furthermore, the capital cost of supplying required housing facilities for the short-term city relief workers and the families would be prohibitive and uneconomical.

The goal of complete mechanization is quite likely to be achieved—but it will take some time. When that time comes, the inefficient labor that you are now trying to follow on the beet farmers will still be unemployed—and you will have only postpone the solution while ruining the solid citizen farmer.

Our domestic beet-sugar industry proved a godsend to the consuming public in World War II, but can it endure economically with a legislated 50-percent increase in labor costs plus the increased capital cost of mechanization? Forty or fifty years ago a farmer could get along with four or five teams that were worth about \$100 per animal and machinery that cost \$75 to \$100 per item. Now tractors, harvesters, etc., cost \$3,000 to \$6,000 each, and the average tenant farmer can easily have a capital investment of \$20,000 or so.

Our cost of sugar production should be as low as economically possible, as our prices are influenced or set by world supply. Does it make sense to legislate a 50-percent increase in labor cost when large producing areas around the world produce with labor costs only a fraction of ours? Also, is it good international relations to kick our neighbors south of the border in the teeth?

On my irrigated farmland of some 1,100 acres, I have six tenant farmers; they represent the kind of families that are the backbone of our American free-enterprise system. One is a grandson of a former tenant of my father, two are sons, and a fourth is married to the daughter of a former tenant. The boys and girls that have come from those farms for three generations are real Americans, and one son of a man who worked for my grandfather and father went to Washington to head up a section. Are we going to legislate those kind of people to second-grade society and relief?

That is what we will do if we solve this problem on the present approach of politics, and continue to ignore the rules and laws of economics.

It is wrong to throw a 50-percent labor cost increase at the farmer when he is facing a water shortage for the second year in a row. The Prewitt Reservoir in Logan County, Colo., is still empty, and our North Sterling Reservoir, dating from the early 1900's, has prospects of being only 50 percent full with the irrigation season now less than 2 months away.

At best, farming is precarious, and my tenant farmers work long hours for a modest return, if Nature is kind. As a landlord, my six farmers, in the 9 years since I inherited them, have produced a gross income (including insurance, rebates for fire, wind, and hail damage, and some \$15,800 soil practices payments) of \$259,615.02, but after total expenses of \$251,727.14 (which includes only modest depreciation as some buildings are 50 years old or more) my net income has been only \$7,887.88. This is an average of \$878.43 per farm over a 9-year period, or an average of only \$97.38 per tenant per year. Not very exciting, considering the constantly increasing cost of repairs, insurance, and taxes—and my land is among some of the better land in the area. Some of my financial friends urge me to liquidate my landholdings and employ the funds in stocks and bonds to better advantage, but I like to think that, in that expenditure of \$251,000, plus a greater one of my combined tenants, we have helped make honest jobs. But if this keeps up, maybe in 2 years when I retire from the bank I'll be forced to accede to their wishes.

April 28, 1965

I think that also I have among the better tenants in the area. Sometimes it is difficult to keep them from becoming discouraged. With the outlook which your Department is harnessing our beet farmers, they may not obtain their usual credit facilities from the local banks. The goal of your Department and the Department of Agriculture should be to reduce the need for farm support—not legislate so that there will be a necessity for more. I enclose three photo-stats of extracts from some of my tenants' correspondence these past couple of months to let you know eloquently how they feel and worry.

Cost for both the tenant farmer and the landlord are constantly rising (my farm real estate taxes last year advanced from 11.2 to 14.7 percent, and it is imperative that we grow the maximum dollar yield per acre crops (beets) so far as sound rotation programs permit in order to break even and stay out of the red. That is true in addition to having good growing weather and conditions. I have urged my tenants to cooperate fully in soil conservation practices but on principle have constantly insisted that they not engage in those practices whereby they might be paid for not growing crops which I feel is boondoggling.

The planting season is here, and I hope that your department and all other departments involved and bureaus in Washington will reconsider and immediately advise the growers that after careful study they will have recourse to their tried and proven labor sources.

While I am leaving this Wednesday for a much needed week of vacation in Florida, after finishing on March 23 a grand jury term that started February 1 (which was in addition to my full-time bank job), I should be happy to come to Washington for conference if you feel that I could further clarify the picture. I shall be a guest of Mrs. Nohowel, 222 El Brillo Way, Palm Beach, telephone 305-833-5821. I should gladly return and make that sacrifice for my farmer boys.

I am taking the liberty to send a copy of this letter to my Congressmen and Senators, and also to Frank A. Kemp, president of the Great Western Sugar Co., a brother Beta from the University of Colorado and a very able executive of the highest integrity.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON D. BLAIR.

JANUARY 6, 1965.

Mr. BLAIR: Enclosed is a clipping from a local paper concerning the wage scale for the beet labor. In the past it was 90 cents per hour. And I understand in the future they are going to raise it 15 percent each year till it gets to a level where local labor will be glad to come to work for us. The only thing is us small farmers won't be around to pay this kind of labor bill. About the only other thing we can do is just let the weeds grow. Any suggestions?

The reservoir is taking in a little water, but they said that if some miracle didn't happen we'd be lucky to get 50 percent of water. Between the water shortage and labor shortage the future looks a little bleak.

JANUARY 23, 1965.

DEAR MR. BLAIR: Sounds like you are having a lot of snow in New York. We had 5 inches of snow, which was most welcome. This is the first moisture we have had all winter. We need 10 times as much yet. The reservoirs are still low. Prewitt is completely dry yet.

As for the crop planning for 1965, looking the situation over with the severe water shortage we had last year and not too much moisture as yet, and also, with this beet labor problem it encounters some very serious thinking and a lot of figuring.

I applied for 53 acres of beets, which I doubt I will get. It will probably be between

40 to 47 acres. This will most certainly be enough the way the outlook is on sugarbeets. We already lost one beet payment in August of 1964 for the 1963 crop. According to the newspaper of Great Western we might lose one or two payments in 1965 for the 1964 sugarbeet crop. Also, the water shortage.

As for beet labor, the Government is setting the price. We will have to pay by the hour instead of by the acre. We have to pay \$1.30 an hour and hire domestic labor, which mainly will be people who are on welfare. I don't think I have to explain on how successful this will be. My opinion is it will be one of the biggest labor flops in American history. They are too lazy to work nowadays. Also, the Government is trying to push through better living quarters for the labor. They are talking about running water, bathrooms, and also furnish some of the household furnishings. The Government will send inspectors around to look at labor houses to see if they are suitable. It's one big mess. Pretty soon the Government is going to tell us what and when on everything we do.

MARCH 24, 1965.

MR. BLAIR: It's getting nearer to planting time and we are still in bad shape as far as water and beet labor is concerned.

At last report they figured the reservoir would end up with about 50 percent water, unless some miracle happens which is pretty doubtful. It's going to be pretty hard to make ends meet with that poor of a water supply. The farm loan people don't think too much of loaning money to farmers with half a supply of water.

They still haven't come up with anything for our beet labor, and the company has told us not to figure on any either. You said to go ahead and plant and see what happens.

It might be a little late to replant if we wait to see if they are going to be too weedy to save. I'm not financially fixed to take too many chances. You know that bankers don't loan too much money on hopes.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of testifying before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of the proposed constitutional amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] with respect to reapportionment.

The other day, I had an opportunity to read an excellent article on this problem written by Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore, and published in synopsis form in the Reader's Digest for March 1965.

I believe that this article clearly sets forth one of the problems this country has faced before; namely, that some States have not gone ahead with reapportionment on their own.

It also clearly shows the great efforts which have been made by the State of Colorado in this particular complex situation and the difficulties Colorado has encountered because of the Supreme Court decision.

The article gives many of the basic reasons why I feel—as I know many others feel—that the passage of this constitutional amendment is imperative and should be accomplished as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD for reading by all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, March 1965]

REAPPORTIONMENT: SHALL THE COURT OR THE PEOPLE DECIDE?

(NOTE.—It is more than a power struggle between city dwellers and country dwellers. At issue in today's political battles over the makeup of State legislatures are fundamental principles of democratic representation.)

(By Holman Harvey and Kenneth O. Gilmore)

Lightning struck last June 15 when the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote reapportionment decision. This decree requires both branches of every State legislature to be strictly based on population only. It represents the most far-reaching change in American political structure since our Constitution was written 178 years ago.

Few issues in recent times have stirred more controversy or created more confusion. Nearly every State in the Nation—from Montana to Maryland, from Alaska to Florida—is struggling to satisfy the Federal judiciary's order. A dozen States have already remapped their legislative districts. Others are desperately trying to meet Court-imposed deadlines or to devise delaying tactics. In the meantime, proposals for a constitutional amendment reversing the Court's action are being seriously debated in Congress and in the States.

Make no mistake, we are at a crossroads: our form of government is in a major crisis. What then are the stakes?

REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

"The basic issue," says Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of law at George Washington University, "is not simply 'one man one vote.' It is fair representation, a concept which philosophers and politicians have been arguing about for ages."

Since the beginning of democracy in the Greek city-states, man has groped for the best ways to govern himself and to achieve a true representation of the people's will. As far back as the 11th century England began to move painfully toward more representative government; kings formed various councils consisting of lords, clerics, and powerful landowners. Later, townships, boroughs and counties were called into councils—originally to be consulted on property taxes.

In America at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, this was the essential question: How could a balanced, genuinely representative form of government be achieved, one that would reflect the majority will while protecting the minority and preventing mob rule? A solution was hammered out by our forefathers. So that the large States could not be controlled by the small or the small steamrollered by the large, a two-house plan was born, with a House of Representatives based on population and a Senate based on geography.

Thomas Jefferson is reputed to have asked George Washington why he favored the system. Washington asked Jefferson why he poured his coffee from cup to saucer. "To cool it" was the response.

"Even so," Washington said, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

As America matured into the world's first successful example of modern constitutional democracy, States adopted the Federal two-house system. By 1961, all but 11 States had constitutions that took into account interests other than population—geographic factors, mainly—so as to achieve fair representation. Missouri's "Little Federal" system

furnishes an example. One house is apportioned on the basis of districts of fairly equal population in both city and rural areas, with districts adjusted every 10 years. In the other chamber each of the 114 counties has at least 1 member. Under these provisions, cooperation between city and rural areas is a valued tradition.

THE CHICKEN VOTE

But—and this is where the rub came—as America's cities grew, some States neglected to reapportion their lower houses. The result was, in many States, unjust rural domination of legislatures. Delaware's house districts had not changed since 1897. So unbalanced was Connecticut's House of Representatives that 1 vote in a rural town was worth 429 votes in Hartford. In New Hampshire's lower house, one district had 1,000 times more residents than another.

One remiss State was Tennessee, with no revisions since 1901. A group went to court to force reapportionment of the assembly, with Memphis resident Charles W. Baker suing the secretary of state, Joe C. Carr. "The pigs and chickens in our smaller counties have better representation in the Tennessee Legislature than the people of Nashville," declared that city's mayor.

The case reached the Supreme Court. Contrary to all previous decisions—and to Justice Felix Frankfurter's warning that the judiciary "ought not to enter this political thicket"—the Court ruled in 1962 that State legislative districts are subject to its judicial scrutiny.

The *Baker v. Carr* decision was a bombshell. It spawned similar reapportionment suits in 34 States. So varied were the court interpretations that cases from six States—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia—were appealed to the High Tribunal.

Then on June 15, 1964, the nine black-robed men filed into the marbled chambers and handed down their shattering decision. In four cases the voting was 8 to 1; in the other two, 6 to 3. In all cases, the long-established "Little Federal" system was knocked out. Chief Justice Earl Warren justified the decision on the provision of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which requires that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." He wrote: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests."

QUESTION THE WISDOM

There were vigorous dissents to the decision. Justice Potter Stewart noted: "The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, or in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

"It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States," said Justice John M. Harlan. "People are not ciphers. Legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect where the electors live."

Aroused critics from both political parties questioned the wisdom of the Court's fiat. The Wall Street Journal summed up the feelings of many when it said, "The Court had a chance to bolster our traditions by requiring one house truly on population, and permitting the other on a geographical or other basis to reflect common interests. Instead of stopping with that, its fiat threw out institutions painfully wrought by experience and tried to substitute abstract theory."

The House of Representatives was so incensed that it rammed through a bill stripping all Federal courts of the power to hear or review State legislative apportionment cases. The Senate passed a "sense of Congress" with the purpose of asking the courts to go slow in forcing State legislatures to fall into line until the whole matter could be reviewed.

PROBLEMS THAT COUNT

Today, as this momentous issue is debated across the land, every citizen should ponder these points:

1. The Court's decree threatens to spark a chain reaction that may go all the way down to the school-board level. There are 3,072 counties in the United States, and 91,185 local governments. How long will it be before the Federal courts poke into each of these units of representative democracy to take head counts and draw boundary lines? A Michigan court recently told Kent County's Board of Supervisors that it must be reapportioned on a population-only basis. Other suits have been filed in New York and California. Where, exactly, will it end?

"Carry the Court's decision to its logical conclusion," says William S. White, Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer and journalist, "and even the historic and deliberate population imbalance in the U.S. Senate could not in any logic longer prevail." After all Nevada's 285,000 citizens elect as many U.S. Senators as do New York's 17 million.

2. The decision will swing the pendulum from legislatures with outdated apportionment and too much rural weight, to legislatures under the raw control of metropolitan vote-getting machines. In 25 States, more than half the population resides in metropolitan areas. In 14 States, three populous counties or fewer will elect more than 50 percent of the legislators.¹ America's sprawling urban areas will call the shots, up and down the land. Chicago will hold sway over Illinois, Detroit over Michigan, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh over Pennsylvania, Phoenix over Arizona, and Las Vegas over Nevada.

The specter of raids on State treasuries by metropolitan-dominated legislatures concerns many. They see pressures mounting for more State funds for urban renewal, relief cases and public housing—with many of the funds being matched by U.S. tax dollars. These spending programs in turn will garner more votes for the city machines. Mayors in some States may soon be far more influential than the governors.

New York is perhaps the most vivid case. Here 38 percent of the population has been able to elect a majority in the Senate, thus protecting certain underpopulated counties of this large State with all its diverse interests. But, under the Court's rule, it is only a matter of time before the New York City metropolitan area, with 63 percent of the State's population, will be completely dominant.

3. Some groups of voters can be wiped out, under a winner take all numerical system. The Court's decision, notes the Christian Science Monitor, "will tend to weaken the complex American system for diffusing power and protecting minorities." For example, under a purely numerical system of redistricting, South Dakota's 30,000 Indians, who live in huge reservations covering entire counties, will lose two State senators who now watch out for their interests.

Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, says: "People have ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Some may be lumbermen, miners,

fishermen or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways, while others are more concerned about the rapid transit system. Certainly the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation, lest important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority."

Chief Justice Warren himself declared, in 1948, when he was Governor of California: "Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the [State] senate to a strictly population basis."

4. The Court's decree is a dangerous intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political affairs of the States. Hardly was the one-man-one-vote decision announced before lower courts showed how fast and how far they were willing to muscle in on the deliberations of State governments. Just 2 days after the June 15 decision, a U.S. district court directed the Michigan Apportionment Commission to come up with a districting plan in 48 hours. In a Vermont case appealed to the Supreme Court, it was ruled in January that the legislature must decide upon a plan and then disband—even though this defies the State constitution.

In Oklahoma a three-man Federal district court ignored the machinery set up by the State for reapportionment and autocratically undertook to rearrange the States' legislative districts itself. It set up a master plan that was a nightmare of free-floating voting zones and mistakes. Angry, Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONROE said: "Hasty and ill-advised redistricting formulas promulgated by the courts can result in confusion and inequities. Good local self-government cannot be imposed from above. It must be generated by the people themselves."

5. The Court's edict means that the citizens of a State can no longer decide upon their own form of representative government. One of the six States involved in the Court's June 15 ruling was Colorado. Few States have so diligently attempted to work out a method of representation tailored to their own unique characteristics. Since it became a State in 1876, its legislature has been reapportioned five times. In the spring of 1962, citizens' groups gathered to work out a reapportionment amendment that would keep pace with the State's increasing urban growth. They split into two camps. One wanted both houses of the general assembly based on population alone; the other supported a Federal plan, keeping geographic representation in the senate.

Each side took its case to the public. They fought up and down the State with countless speeches, debates, newspaper ads, billboard posters, radio and TV spots. This referendum overshadowed all other election issues in Colorado that year. And the outcome was stunningly clear. The "Federal plan" won by 305,700 to 172,725. It carried every county in the State.

The amendment was challenged; it was upheld by a Federal district court. And then, on June 15, the Supreme Court threw out Colorado's plan. In an amazing statement, Chief Justice Warren said that, because the plan adopted was contrary to the Court's new ruling, Colorado's referendum vote was "without Federal constitutional significance."

There were stinging dissents. Said Justice Tom C. Clark: "Colorado, by an overwhelming vote, has written the organization of its legislative body into its constitution. In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and

¹ Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington.

thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship."

Today Colorado's senate has been redrawn to satisfy the Court. But the issue is still being debated. Meanwhile, the voters wonder what, if anything, their ballot is worth, or their State constitution.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Only one recourse is left to American citizens who wish to restore our representative system to its original integrity: an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Today in Congress, and in the States, forces are gathering behind proposals that would:

1. Guarantee the citizens of every State the right to decide for themselves, by one-man, one-vote ballot, the apportionment of their own legislature.

2. Guarantee that this power will not be curtailed or reviewed by any Federal court.

3. Guarantee that one house of each legislature can reflect factors other than population if such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people.

This in essence would be the 25th amendment to the Constitution. Whether it is passed in Congress and ratified by the States will depend upon the support it receives from the American people. The stakes are high—as high as the preservation of our Republic.

DR. TELLER CONTINUES TO BE WRONG; LET US DEFEAT CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTER PROPOSAL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, throughout the great debate in Congress on the ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the chief opponent in the scientific community, and practically the only nationally noted scientist to oppose ratification of the treaty, was Dr. Edward Teller.

Personally, I am very proud that the limited nuclear test ban treaty, so patiently and thoroughly sought by President Eisenhower and by President Truman before him, was finally ratified by the Senate during the term of our great late President John F. Kennedy. It will stand as one of the many monuments to his wisdom and determination.

Throughout that time Dr. Teller was wrong in opposing the ratification of this treaty. He direly predicted doom for this Nation were the nuclear test ban treaty to be ratified.

The treaty was ratified by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, and the first step toward permanent peace in this grim period of international anarchy was taken, the first step in a journey of a thousand miles, as it was so eloquently stated by our late great President Kennedy. In years to come historians may look upon the ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty as the most important single action taken by the U.S. Senate in this decade. It is certainly our hope and prayer and the prayer of free people the world over that eventually peoples of the world will enjoy permanent peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Dr. Teller was dead wrong in 1962 and 1963. He is wrong now. The nuclear test ban treaty has succeeded. There have been no violations. In fact, our Government has conducted more underground nuclear tests than has the Soviet Union.

Now this prophet of doom, Edward Teller, is highly critical of Government apathy toward the holes in the ground referred to by high salaried civil defense officials as "fallout shelters." He urges that the Federal Government undertake a mass shelter program, which by his own estimate will cost at least \$20 billion over the next 10 years. This is a conservative estimate.

Herman Kahn, one of the foremost proponents of fallout shelters, has estimated that a reasonable program might involve a gradual buildup from about \$1 billion annually to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5 billion annually. A recent estimate by Prof. John Ullman, chairman of the Department of Management of Hofstra College, would place the cost of an effective civil defense shelter system as high as \$302 billion. Regardless of which of the expert opinions is cited, the price tag would be astronomical. Even then, there is no guarantee that a shelter program will be at all effective. With extensive advances being made in rocket and nuclear technology, many shelters would probably be obsolete and utterly useless before completion. One of the scientists now working on advanced weapons technology is reported to have said: "You ain't seen nothing yet, compared with what is coming into sight in the way of new weapons."

There is the possibility of more deadly types of warfare for which shelters would offer no protection whatever—chemical and biological warfare. Any nation that would unleash a thermonuclear war would probably not hesitate to use other methods equally as terrifying.

Is the Congress prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and to spend perhaps \$200 billion of taxpayers' money? Let us have no illusions. In reality this is what the civil defense planners and alarmists such as Edward Teller are asking us to do.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look into the matter is aware of the fact that most building owners have ignored or refused requests to provide shelters, and that ordinary citizens have lost interest. During each crisis the get-rich-quick shelter salesmen appear. As soon as the crisis abates and public interest fades completely, they crawl back under the rocks from whence they came.

Communities throughout the Nation are awakening to the fact that thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money have been spent on foolish programs with no tangible results except for the fact that in many instances lush positions at the public trough were provided for ex-politicians and city hall parasites.

Mr. President, there is no shelter building program in Great Britain, France, or in any of the major Western Powers. Reliable observers in the Soviet Union re-

port that there is no fallout shelter program in Russia. Henry Shapiro, dean of the American correspondents in Moscow, wrote:

No foreigner here has seen any civil defense shelters. The average citizen is unaware of the existence of shelters.

Preston Grover of the Associated Press stated:

Attachés from embassies who have looked around the country for signs of shelters have found nothing. Foreigners live in many of the newest buildings put up in Moscow, and they have no bomb shelters.

In 1961, the New York Times published a report from Moscow by Harrison Salisbury which stated:

About 12,000 miles of travel in the Soviet Union by this correspondent in the last 4 weeks failed to turn up evidence of a single Soviet bomb shelter. Diplomats, foreign military attachés, and correspondents who have traveled widely in the Soviet Union report that there is no visible evidence of a widespread shelter program.

Gen. Curtis LeMay and others have said that our protection lies in spending money for offensive and defensive weapons, rather than in preparing to hide in holes, waiting for conquering paratroopers to come.

Mr. President, this year the Congress is being asked to appropriate \$200 million to perpetuate this ridiculous shelter scheme. This is twice the amount requested by the President for the Peace Corps; it is 125 times the amount requested for the Commission on Civil Rights; it is 28 times the amount requested for the Small Business Administration.

Wherever and whenever possible our President and we in the Congress should be endeavoring to effect economy in Government without curtailing vital and needed programs both foreign and domestic. In good conscience we should not appropriate anywhere near the huge sum requested for civil defense purposes. To do so would be to make a sham of efforts toward more economy in Government, to encourage waste of taxpayers' money at all levels of Government, and a slap in the face to taxpayers.

Mr. President, the average salary in the Civil Defense Division of the Department of Defense is one of the highest in any agency in the Federal Government—\$11,478 a year. Compare with \$10,085 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$8,318 for the Small Business Administration, and \$8,467 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation—agencies that are performing essential and worthwhile public services.

Out of a total of 991 employees in the Civil Defense Division of the Department of Defense, 481—almost half—are GS-13 or above receiving from \$13,336 to \$27,000 a year. The remaining 510 are paid from \$4,417 to \$10,982 a year. Fifty-eight percent of those employed with the Civil Defense Division are classified as professional employees; that is, GS-12 or above. Compare this with 35 percent in the FBI and 37 percent in the NASA. What justification is there for such a high percentage of supersalaried bureaucrats in an agency performing so

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 28, 1965

little service to taxpayers. The civil defense bureaucrats receive the most and do the least of all officials or employees of any agencies or departments in our Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, these officials and employees do very little for their money except concoct plans and send messages to each other, and think up silly schemes which would accomplish very little except annoy citizens. They make estimates that if thus and so happens, 50 million Americans will be killed. It is said that figures do not lie, but that liars figure. Incidentally, they issue a civil defense booklet on how to live through a nuclear bombing. In it they state:

If you were near the explosion without adequate protection, you would be seriously affected by the immediate radiation, in addition to being killed.

There is no excuse whatever for the waste of money and personnel for the civil defense agency as now operated. Since its inception it has cost American taxpayers more than one and a half billion dollars with no tangible results whatever.

Mr. President, when I first began my investigation, research and protests against wasteful civil defense spending early in 1959 I was virtually alone in the Congress. Today I know that many of my colleagues share my views. This is evidenced by rollcall votes at various times on efforts to reduce such spending, and by the fact last year we in the Senate succeeded in defeating in committee the civil defense bill passed in the House of Representatives, authorizing an expenditure of \$193 million.

I am hopeful that a majority of Senators will agree this year to the urgent necessity for drastically reducing the appropriations for this boondoggle.


THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the President met with the press in a conference which was covered by TV and radio. His words were widely disseminated throughout the Nation and the world. It is most fortunate that they were because it was an excellent and highly informative interview. The President spoke with detailed knowledge on a great range of subjects. His responses were frank, straightforward, and most informative.

In particular, President Johnson's remarks on Vietnam and other international issues are of exceptional importance. They should be read and reread by all concerned both here and abroad. Once again, he underscored his great desire and continuing quest for a rational peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia. He deplored the violence which

prevails there, noting correctly that it is being suffered most not in North Vietnam but in South Vietnam and by Americans as well as Vietnamese.

He made clear that his desire is to see a termination of this violence, on all sides and as quickly as possible. To that end, he stressed once again his willingness to enter into unconditional discussions. I would hope that this open door to peaceful settlement will be noted, along with his determination to stay with the situation until the people of Vietnam do have an assured freedom of choice as to their future. Both his words of peace and his determination should be heeded in Hanoi, Saigon, and among all those who are carrying on the warfare in South Vietnam.

I would call attention, too, to the President's expressed aversion to the name-calling and labeling which has accompanied some of the debate and discussion of the Vietnamese question. Discussion in the Senate on Vietnam or any foreign policy issue, as I have noted on many previous occasions, has been and can continue to be useful. The President's comments on this matter in his press conference point the way to their most effective utilization. I quote these words in full:

I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name-calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. And I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me.

These words are an appropriate answer to those who have taken exception to the immense value—indeed, the vital necessity—to the Nation of free and responsible discussion of all points of view on the Vietnamese situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's press conference be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the news conference was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 28, 1965]

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

(NOTE.—Following is a transcript of President Johnson's news conference in Washington yesterday, as recorded by the New York Times.)

OPENING STATEMENT

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to see that you are willing to trade your new comfort in the west lobby for these straightbacked chairs in the East Room.

Today I have somewhat of a conflict of emotions. I wanted to give you due and adequate 3-day notice of a press conference, and at the same time I didn't want to manage the news by holding up announcement of some appointees I have here today. So, we have tried to reconcile the two, and a little later in the statement I want to present to you some men that, over the weekend, I selected to occupy some important posts in Government.

VIETNAM STRUGGLE

We are engaged in a crucial struggle in Vietnam. Some may consider it a small war, but to the men who give their lives it is the last war, and the stakes are high.

Independent South Vietnam has been attacked by North Vietnam. The object of that attack is total conquest. Defeat in South Vietnam would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression.

It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach. Our own welfare, our own freedom, would be in great danger.

This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace.

At every step of the way we have used our great power with the utmost restraint. We have made every effort possible to find a peaceful solution. We have done this in the face of the most outrageous and brutal provocation against Vietnamese and against Americans alike.

Through the first 7 months of 1964, both Vietnamese and Americans were the targets of constant attacks of terror. Bombs exploded in helpless villages, in downtown movie theaters, even at the sports fields where the children played. Soldiers and civilians, men and women, were murdered and crippled, yet we took no action against the source of this brutality—North Vietnam.

When our destroyers were attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin, as you will remember, last summer, we replied promptly with a single raid. The punishment then was limited to the deed.

For the next 6 months we took no action against North Vietnam. We warned of danger. We hoped for caution in others.

Their answer was attack and explosion and indiscriminate murder. So, it soon became clear that our restraint was viewed as weakness; our desire to limit conflict was viewed as a prelude to our surrender. We could no longer stand by while attack mounted and while the bases of the attackers were immune from reply.

And, therefore, we began to strike back.

But America has not changed her essential position—and that purpose is peaceful settlement; that purpose is to resist aggression; that purpose is to avoid a wider war.

I say again that I will talk to any government, anywhere, any time, without any conditions; and, if any doubt our sincerity, let them test us. Each time we have met with silence or slander or the sound of guns, but, just as we will not flag in battle, we will not weary in the search for peace.

So, I reaffirm my offer of unconditional discussions. We will discuss any subject and any point of view with any government concerned. This offer may be rejected, as it has been in the past, but it will remain open, waiting for the day when it becomes clear to all that armed attack will not yield domination over others.

And I will continue along the course that we have set—firmness with moderation, readiness for peace with refusal to retreat.

For this is the same battle which we've fought for a generation. Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored and liberty has been maintained. This was true under President Truman, under President Eisenhower, under President Kennedy, and it will be true again in southeast Asia.

STEEL AGREEMENT

I want to go now to another subject.

I want to congratulate the negotiators for the steel companies and the United Steelworkers Union on the statesmanlike agree-

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

8483

ment that they reached yesterday to extend their contract. I hope and I expect that it will be approved by the union's committee tomorrow.

While the settlement reached in steel is only an interim one, I think we can be confident that the final settlement will be a responsible one which full considers not only the interests of the immediate parties but also the larger public interest.

So far in 1965, our record of wage-price stability remains intact. A survey of the wage increases in more than 600 collective bargains settled so far this year shows that, on the average, the percentage increases were unchanged from the moderate increases agreed on in the same period last year. A number of important settlements were at approximately the level of our guideweeks. And this record of private action is most encouraging.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Today I can report to you and to the Nation that our expanding economy will produce higher Federal revenues this year than we estimated to Congress in January.

I can also report that our continuing drive to hold down Government spending will produce lower expenditures this year than we estimated to Congress in January.

As a result, we expect the actual budget deficit for fiscal 1965 to be at least \$1 billion below the \$6.3 billion estimated last January, when we sent our budget to Congress.

Our expenditures, therefore, will be decreased by approximately \$500 million under our estimate, and the revenues collected will be increased approximately \$500 million over our estimates.

JOB CORPS CAMPS

I'm pleased also to announce today that the war on poverty is setting 10 new Job Corps conservation camps in nine States. They have run to 87 the number of centers that provide skills and education to our youngsters who are out of school and of work. These new centers will be located in the States of Arizona and Maine and Minnesota and Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Utah, and Washington.

ADMINISTRATION POSTS

Now, today, I would like to introduce to you some gentlemen that I intend to nominate for new assignments in this administration.

First, Mr. Alan Boyd. He is 42 years of age, he's Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, he's a distinguished lawyer and a very competent public servant. Mr. Boyd will become Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Senate being willing.

Mr. Warren Wiggins. Mr. Wiggins is 42 years old, with a master's degree in public administration from Harvard. In 1962 he was chosen one of the 10 outstanding men in the Federal Government. He's been with the Peace Corps since 1961. Today I'm nominating him as deputy director of the Peace Corps.

Dr. John A. Schnittker. He's 41 years old, with a Ph. D. from Iowa State University. He's one of the Nation's outstanding farm authorities. He's been director of agricultural economics with the Department of Agriculture. Today I'm nominating him to become Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Charles S. Murphy. This judicious and able man has served in Government for 21 years under four Presidents. He was President Truman's special counsel in the White House. He has performed with outstanding quality as Under Secretary of Agriculture. Today I'm nominating him to become chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Gen. William F. McKee. He is a four-star general who was a vice chief of the Air Force and on retirement became special assistant to the administrator of the National Aero-

nautics and Space Administration. Secretary McNamara has called him one of the most knowledgeable and competent administrators in the Defense Department with skills in research and development and administration, procurement and logistics, and today I'm nominating him to be the new administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, Mr. Cohen is a dedicated career public servant who has served the Government for 26 years as a full-time civil servant and another 5 years as a consultant. Since 1961 he has been an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Today I am nominating him for a promotion to become Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mr. Donald F. Turner. Mr. Turner is 44 years old, a Phi Beta Kappa from Northwestern University. He has a Ph. D. in economics from Harvard and a law degree from Yale. He's been a law clerk to Supreme Court Justice and is widely and favorably known throughout the Nation for his work and writing in the antitrust legal field. He is currently a visiting law professor at Stanford University in California. Today I'm nominating him to become Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. Leonard C. Meeker, who is a career attorney with 25 years of Government service. He is a Phi Beta Kappa from Amherst College. Since 1961, he has served as deputy legal adviser in the State Department. Today I am nominating him to become legal adviser in the State Department.

DOMINICAN CRISIS

We are all very much concerned about the serious situation which has developed in the last few hours in the Dominican Republic. Fighting has occurred among different elements of the Dominican armed forces and other groups. Public order in the capital at Santo Domingo has broken down.

Due to the gravity of the situation and the possible danger to lives of American citizens in the Dominican Republic, I ordered the evacuation of those who wished to leave. As you know, the evacuation is now proceeding. My latest information is that 1,000 Americans have already been taken aboard ships of the U.S. Navy off the port of Haina, 8 miles west of Santo Domingo.

We profoundly deplore the violence and disorder in the Dominican Republic. The situation is grave and we are following the developments very closely. It is our hope that order can promptly be restored and that a peaceful settlement of their internal problems can be found.

DEATH OF MURROW

I have just received the sad news of the passing of Edward R. Murrow. It came to me just a little while ago. I believe that all of us feel a deep sense of loss. We who knew him knew that he was a gallant fighter, a man who dedicated his life, both as a newspaperman and as a public official, to an unrelenting search for truth. He subscribed to the proposition that free men and free inquiry are inseparable. He built his life on that unbreakable truth. We have all lost a friend.

QUESTIONS

1. Vietnam policy

Question. Mr. President, do you think any of the participants in the national discussion on Vietnam could appropriately be likened to the appeasers of 25 or 30 years ago?

Answer. I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. And I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me.

2. India border strife

Question. Mr. President, what can you—can you tell us your reaction, or any information you have, on the reports of seemingly intensified fighting between the Indians and the forces of Pakistan, and could this possibly relate or have an effect on the fighting in Vietnam?

Answer. We deplore fighting wherever it takes place. We have been in close touch with the situation there. We are very hopeful that ways and means can be found to avoid conflict between these two friends of our country. I talked to Secretary Rusk about it within the hour, and we are anxious to do anything and everything that we can do to see that peace is restored in that area and conflict is ended.

3. Disarmament talks

Question. Mr. President, today the Soviet Union agreed to a French proposal for a five-power nuclear disarmament conference which would include Communist China as a nuclear power. What would be your attitude to this proposal, sir?

Answer. I have not studied the proposal and was not familiar with the fact that it had been made.

4. Vietnam talks

Question. Mr. President, the only formal answer so far to your Baltimore speech was that by the North Vietnamese Prime Minister, Pham Van Dong, who offered a four-point formula, which he suggested was a possible basis for negotiations. My question is: Do you regard the four points as so unacceptable as to be a complete rejection of your offer to begin discussions or are there portions of the four points which interest you and which you might be willing to discuss?

Answer. I think that it was very evident from the Baltimore speech that most of the non-Communist countries in the world welcomed the proposal in that speech and most of the Communist countries found objections to it. I am very hopeful that some ways and means can be found to bring the parties who are interested in southeast Asia to a conference table.

Now just what those ways and means will be I do not know. But every day we explore to the limit of our capacity every possible political and diplomatic move that would bring that about.

5. Chinese volunteers

Question. I wonder, sir, if you could evaluate for us the threat that's been posed by Red China to send volunteers into Vietnam if we escalate the war further?

Answer. We have read their statements from time to time and the statements of other powers about what they propose to do. We are in close touch with the situation and that's all I think I would like to say on that matter.

6. War on poverty

Question. Mr. President, there's been some criticism at the local level in this country of your war on poverty and one of the chief complaints is that the local community action groups do not represent the poor. Have you found any basis for this criticism and do you feel that criticism such as this could have a demoralizing effect on the overall program?

Answer. Yes, I think that there has been unjust criticism, and unfair criticism, and uninformed criticism of the poverty program even before Congress passed it.

Some people opposed it every step of the way, some people oppose it now. I don't know of any national program in peace time that has reached so many people so fast and so effectively.

Over 16,000 Americans have already volunteered to live and work with the Peace Corps domestically. A quarter of a million young men have joined the Job Corps. Every major

April 28, 1965

city has developed poverty plans and made applications for funds. Three hundred States and city and county community action programs have already received their money. Forty-five thousand students from needy families are already enrolled in 800 colleges under the work program.

More than 125,000 adults are trainees in adult education on the work experience program.

We will have difficulties, we will have politicians attempting to get some jobs in the local level; we'll have these differences as we do in all of our programs. But I have great confidence in Sargent Shriver as an administrator and as a man. And I have great confidence in the wisdom the Congress displayed in passing the poverty program and I think it will be one of the great monuments to this administration.

7. U.S. prestige

Question. Mr. President, is it true that the United States is losing rather than making friends around the world with its policy in Vietnam—sort of a falling-domino theory in reverse?

Answer. I think that we have friends throughout the world. I'm not concerned with any friends that we've lost. Following my Baltimore speech, I received from our allies almost universal approval.

Our enemies would have you believe that we are following policies that are ill-advised, but we are following the same policies in Asia that we followed in Europe, that we followed in Turkey and Greece and Iran. We are resisting aggression, and as long as the aggressors attack, we will stay there and resist them, whether we make friends or lose friends.

8. Voting rights bill

Question. Mr. President, your voting rights bill is moving toward completion in the Senate this week. Do you think that the proposal—the amendment to abolish the poll tax would make this unconstitutional? Do you think it would damage the passage of the bill in the House? And what do you think about it generally?

Answer. I think that that is being worked out in conferences they're having today and they will have in the next few weeks. I have always opposed the poll tax. I am opposed to it now. I have been advised by constitutional lawyers that we have a problem in repealing the poll tax by statute.

For that reason, while a Member of Congress, I initiated and supported a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax in Federal elections. I think the bill as now drawn will not permit the poll tax to be used to discriminate against voters, and I think the administration will have adequate authority to prevent its use for that purpose. I have asked the Attorney General, however, to meet with the various Members of the House and Senate who are interested in this phase of it and, if possible, take every step that he can within constitutional bounds to see that the poll tax is not used as a discrimination against any voter, anywhere.

9. Critics of bombing

Question. Mr. President, a number of critics of your Vietnam policy say they support our presence in South Vietnam but do not support the bombing raids to the North. I wonder if there is anything you can say to them and what you can say on any conditions that might arise under which you feel the raids could be stopped?

Answer. I said in my opening statement that we went for months without destroying a bridge, or an ammunition depot, or a radar station. Those military targets have been the primary targets that we have attacked. There's no blood in a bridge made of concrete and steel.

But we do try to take it out so that people cannot furnish additional troops and addi-

tional equipment to kill the people of South Vietnam and to kill our own soldiers.

There are not many civilians involved in a radar station. But we do try to make it ineffective so that they cannot plot our planes and shoot our boys out of the skies. There are not many individuals involved in an ammunition dump. But we have tried to destroy that ammunition so it would be exploded in North Vietnam and not in the bodies of the people of South Vietnam or our American soldiers.

We have said time and again that we regret the necessity of doing this. But as long as aggression continues, as long as they bomb in South Vietnam, as long as they bomb our sports arenas and our theaters and our embassies and kill our women and our children, and the Vietnamese soldiers—several thousand of whom have been killed since the first of the year—we think that we are justified in trying to slow down that operation and make them realize that it is very costly and that their aggression should cease.

I do sometimes wonder how some people can be so concerned with our bombing a cold bridge of steel and concrete in North Vietnam but never open their mouth about a bomb being placed in our Embassy in South Vietnam.

The moment that this aggression ceases, the destruction of their bridges and their radar stations, and the ammunition that they use on * * *

10. Shastri visit

Question. Mr. President, on your cancellation of the Ayub and Shastri visits, some of your critics have said that the reasons for your postponement were sound, but the abruptness of it left millions of Asians angry at this country. Is anything being done to correct that impression on their part?

Answer. Well, first of all, I would not assume many parts of your statement. First, we didn't cancel it, so that's the first error that the critics have made. We feel very friendly toward the people of India and the Government of India, toward the people of Pakistan and the Government of Pakistan. I have spent some time in both of those countries.

I've had the leaders of those countries visit me in this country, and visit in my home. I have before the Congress now recommendations concerning the peoples of those countries, and how we can work together to try to achieve peace in the world.

I said, through the appropriate channels, to those governments that I had had some 8 or 9 visitors already the first 90 days of this administration, that the Congress was hopeful that it would get out of here early summer, that we had approximately 75 top important measures that we were trying to get considered and passed, 1 of which vitally affected that part of the world, and that I could be much more communicative and could respond much more to their suggestions and to their recommendations on the future of India and their 5-year plan and Pakistan and their plan if our visit could follow the enactment of some of these bills instead of precede them, because if they preceded them, I could not speak with authority—I would not know what the Congress would do.

We will spend—we have spent, oh, in excess of \$10 billion in that area, and this year we will propose expenditures of more than \$1 billion. But if the Congress said "No" to me, and didn't pass the foreign aid bill or materially reduced it, I would have made a commitment that I could not support.

So I said that if you would like to come now, in the month of May or June during this period, we can have a visit, but we will not be able to be as responsive as I would like to be if you could come a little later in the year.

And I've been host a few times in my life, and when you put things that way, most peo-

ple want to come at the time that would be most convenient to us—to the host—and would be most helpful to them. And we communicated that to the appropriate people, and the answer came back that they would accept that decision.

Now I think it was a good decision in our interest, and I think it was a good decision in their interest, and I'm very sorry that our people have made a good deal of it.

But the provocation of the differences sometimes comes about, and I regret it, and so far as I know, it's a good decision and a wise one and one that I would make again at the moment.

11. Nuclear weapons

Question. Mr. President, there were—in light of the new reports that came over the weekend, I wonder if you could clarify for us your position concerning the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons in southeast Asia?

Answer. Well, first of all, I have the responsibility for decision on nuclear weapons. That rests with the President. It is the most serious responsibility that rests with him. Secretary McNamara very carefully and very clearly in his television appearance yesterday covered that subject thoroughly and, I think, adequately, and there's not anything that I could really add to what he said.

I would observe this, that I've been President for 17 months, and I have sat many hours and weeks with the officials of this Government in trying to plan for the protection and security of our people, and I have never had a suggestion from a single official of this Government or employee of this Government concerning the use of such weapons in this area.

The only person that has ever mentioned it to me has been a newspaperman writing a story, and each time I tell him, please, get it out of your system—please forget it. There's just not anything to it. No one has discussed it with us at all. And I think that when Secretary McNamara told you of the requirement yesterday, and that no useful purpose was served by going into it further, I thought it had ended there.

12. Charge by Hanoi

Question. Mr. President, the North Vietnamese today, sir, say that in a raid on Sunday the United States and South Vietnam used what they called toxic chemicals. Now can you tell us, sir, what they might be talking about?

Answer. I wouldn't know. I frequently see statements they make that we never heard of, and I don't know about the particular report that you mention.

13. Troops in Vietnam

Question. Mr. President, are there—could there come about, as you now see the situation in Vietnam, could there be circumstances in which the—which large numbers of American troops might be engaged in the fighting of the war rather than in the advising and assistance to the South Vietnamese?

Answer. Our purpose in Vietnam is, as you well know, to advise and to assist those people in resisting aggression. We are performing that duty there now. I would not be able to anticipate or to speculate on the conduct of each individual in the days ahead.

I think that if the enemy there believes that we are there to stay, that we are not going to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends, I believe in due time peace can be observed in that area.

My objective is to contribute what we can to assist the people of South Vietnam, who have lost thousands of lives defending their country and to provide the maximum amount of deterrent with the minimum cost. They have lost thousands of people since February. We have lost some 40 to 50 people of our own. We could not anticipate in February whether we'd lose 50 or whether we'd lose 500.

That depends on the fortunes and the problems of conflict. But I can assure you that we are being very careful, we're being very studious, and we're being very deliberate—that we're trying to do everything we can within reason to convince these people that they should not attack, that they should not be aggressors, that they should not try to follow—swallow up their neighbor, and we are doing it with the minimum amount of expenditure of lives that we can spend.

14. Steel productivity

Question. Mr. President, labor, and management in steel have different versions of what their increase in productivity is. Can you tell us what your advisers figure this is and whether you think a settlement in excess of 2.7 percent of the interim agreement would be acceptable?

Answer. I don't want to pass on—we have laid down the guideposts, they're well acquainted with them, both management and employees. They have had very responsible negotiations.

We are very pleased with the outcome of those negotiations. We anticipate that they will be confirmed by both parties very shortly, and we believe between now and the September deadline that we will have an agreement.

I don't think that I've ever observed a period in the life of free enterprise in this country when American labor and American business have been more responsible and have been more anxious to work with this Government in maintaining full productivity, and I expect that that will come about.

Question. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to applaud the strong stand of the President as it concerns the position of this Nation in Vietnam. The President made it clear that we are in Vietnam to resist aggression, that we are there to help a friendly government protect itself against subversion and aggression from without.

We wish to see that the Government of North Vietnam keeps its pledged word under the Geneva agreement which it signed, an agreement which that Government has violated in many ways.

It is costing this Government the lives of many American fighting men to assist a friendly power. Let me point out to those who do not seem to be aware of it, that the friendly Government of South Vietnam is doing the fighting there, that only a small portion of the fighting is being done by American troops. We have approximately 30,000 troops in that area. There are approximately 500,000 South Vietnamese troops fighting in the area. In other words, South Vietnam has approximately 15 men fighting against communism for every man the United States has there to assist that friendly power. In addition, our friends who are doing the fighting have done a rather good job of it. The estimate I saw was that approximately 89,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese invaders have been killed by the forces of South Vietnam which has not sustained nearly so many casualties as the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese invaders. It has been estimated that approximately one South Vietnamese has been killed in battle, or missing, for every three Vietcong killed. The last figures I saw indicate that the kill ratio in battle for the fighters whom we are supporting in South

Vietnam in recent weeks is approximately six Vietcong killed for every South Vietnamese lost.

On that basis, it appears that the enemy has lost approximately 200 men for every 1 American lost in the defense of freedom against communism.

Mr. President, if we have to run up the white flag and surrender to a small backward Communist power of 19 million people when the enemy is suffering casualties 200 times as great as ours, then this great Nation of over 190 million will be a far cry from what it has been in my time.

I notice that the present Presiding Officer in the chair is the new Senator from the State of South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], who was on the "Today" program this morning. He made an excellent presentation, for one who has not had an occasion to study the question at the Washington level because he was discharging his responsibilities as Governor of South Carolina. He showed an understanding of the problem. He stated what I believe to be the case in Louisiana, that the people in our State are behind the President in his efforts to resist Communist subversion and aggression.

We applaud the President for the position he takes, that we will not surrender to communism, that we will meet force with greater force, that we will use such force as may be necessary, that we are not going to let Communist aggressors and Communist revolutionaries overthrow friendly powers by means of brutality, murder, kidnaping, assassination, or whatever device along that line happens to fit their methods.

The President stated quite clearly that this Nation is willing to negotiate. My impression is that every diplomatic channel available to us has been used to inform both the powers of Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that we are ready to negotiate at any time, on any honorable and reasonable basis; but that we are not prepared to surrender. We intend to strike them when they strike us, that when they undertake to attack Americans, to attack our ships at sea, to blast down our barracks and assassinate our people, we expect to strike them with whatever means are available to us and which seem appropriate to use under particular circumstances.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the text of yesterday's news conference by President Johnson has already been placed in the RECORD by the majority leader. I recommend his statement on Vietnam to my colleagues and to all Americans as a clear, unequivocal, easily understood declaration of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, repeatedly I have made it clear on the floor of the Senate that I want to stand as a part of the solid phalanx of Members of the Senate and the people of the country who offer prayers and support for President Johnson as he deals with the delicate, grave, and troublesome problems of southeast Asia and South Vietnam.

I would first observe that those who look for immediate and dramatic solution to the "South Vietnam problem" or the "southeast Asia problem" by negotiation or unilateral action by the United States, whether it be the strategic bombing of cities or the withdrawal of our forces and a cessation of the present bombing of military targets, look in vain. History shows that in International relations, as in human relations, serious problems are seldom lastingly solved in one fell swoop.

We must prepare for a long period ahead when our perseverance and continuing interest in the peoples of southeast Asia will be required if their economic, social and political rights as individuals are to be allowed to flourish and develop, free from external aggression and internal terrorism and unrest.

While we are deeply motivated by a national sense of compassion and humanity, we must nevertheless continue to recognize that our own interests are involved in South Vietnam; that our power and prestige have been committed there by three Presidents; that those in that area who seek to build their own future free of Communist domination are watching closely to judge how valid our commitment to them is in the light of how we respond to our obligations to South Vietnam.

History clearly shows that aggression, even in that tiny and remote area of the world designated South Vietnam, threatens the peace and security of our country and of the world.

History clearly teaches that unchecked aggression builds and feeds on itself and is reproduced and duplicated until stopping it requires a much greater cost in lives and treasure than if resistance had first been made.

Furthermore, almost no one now faults President Truman for his momentous decision, following World War II, under the courageous Truman doctrine, to aid Greece, for example, to stabilize its political independence and its resistance to Communist domination, by helping it to quell Communist guerrilla activities within its borders, activities which were aided and abetted externally.

The case of aggression in Vietnam is even more flagrant. Let no one say that this country is more interested in Europe than in Asia. Let it be known that this country is as interested in the peoples of Asia as it is in the peoples of Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "L.B.J.'s Appeal for Viet Peace," published in the San Francisco Chronicle in April 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,
Apr. 1965]

L.B.J.'S APPEAL FOR VIET PEACE

The transcendent sincerity and earnest good will of Lyndon Johnson are qualities which show through the TV screen on occasions like the Johns Hopkins speech on Vietnam Wednesday night. Many confused Americans who had been wondering darkly what the President was really up to in southeast Asia, suddenly found themselves

April 28, 1965

swept along with the Johnson dream of a Great Society along the Mekong.

Such is the measure of a great speech, that it can convert doubts into conviction and cross purposes into purposeful new directions. This timely, indeed overdue, address reached occasional peaks of eloquence (we offer an example in the editorial below) and conveyed the impression that our intentions in Vietnam are both humane and plausible. Undoubtedly almost every American who heard or read it was filled with renewed hope that somehow the President's offers—of "unconditional discussions" and of a billion dollars for southeast Asia's development program—will promptly bring negotiators to a table where peace with honor can be agreed to.

For unquestionably, the American people want to get detached from the interminable conflict that has been going on almost without interruption in Indochina since the early 1940's. Yet at the same time, most would heartily support the President in refusing to abandon South Vietnam, "this small and brave nation," to its enemy.

Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack, said the President, and he wishes it were possible to "convince others with words of what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes," namely, that armed hostility is futile because our resources are equal to any challenge. Once this is clear, there could be many ways to peace through "unconditional discussions" with the governments concerned; in large groups or small ones; in the reaffirmation of old agreements (the Geneva agreement of 1954?); or in new ones that strengthen the old.

This constitutes an offer, and it is clearly his hope that those who threaten South Vietnam's independence, i.e., "the leaders of North Vietnam," will respond to it. If they do respond, a mighty aid program beneficial to all countries of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, will be set in motion.

However the Communist powers may react, and that will probably not become clear for some time, the President's speech has very effectively impressed the British, the Canadians and the French, whose support we certainly need; and it has earned the warm approbation of Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, whose good offices were only recently being rather summarily rebuffed by the State Department.

The prestige and good name of America have been rescued and repaired; we hope and believe, by the President's performance.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, while the hope expressed in the editorial that the response from the other side would be favorable to the President's call for "unconditional discussion" has not thus far materialized, nevertheless, the editorial calls to mind again, in the midst of public dialog on this subject, that President Johnson has no policy in southeast Asia other than peace and stability, and that his speech at Johns Hopkins University brought recognition of that fact here and abroad.

Each of us should be careful to note in our remarks that our goal is peace; and that President Johnson has clearly declared how it may be achieved.

Each of us should recognize that he who takes risks now in order to achieve a just and lasting peace is no less a peacemaker than he who advocates peace immediately but with no assurances against having to defend or enforce it later at a much greater price.

THE NEW EDUCATION BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The New Education Bill," written by W. Barry Garrett, associate director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baptist Messenger, Apr. 22, 1965]

THE NEW EDUCATION BILL

(By W. Barry Garrett, associate director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.)

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has passed the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress by overwhelming majorities. The bill has been signed by the President and is now the law of the land.

Much confusion is abroad about the bill. This brief question and answer article will attempt to clarify some of the misunderstandings about it.

Question. What are the provisions of the bill?

Answer. It extends the federally impacted area aid program for another 2 years. In addition it does the following:

1. It authorizes \$1.06 billion for public school agencies for the education of children of low-income families.

2. It authorizes \$100 million to State public education agencies for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

3. It authorizes \$100 million to public school agencies for the creation of supplementary educational centers and services available to all the schoolchildren in a community.

4. It authorizes \$100 million to be allocated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to universities, colleges, and other public and private research agencies to develop educational research and training.

5. It authorizes \$25 million for grants to States to strengthen State departments of education.

The total of these authorized appropriations is \$1.385 billion.

Question. Does the bill give aid to parochial schools?

Answer. The bill does not authorize any grant of funds or provide for services to private schools. All of the appropriations for elementary and secondary education are to public agencies.

Question. Does the bill give aid to parochial school pupils?

Answer. Yes. If the private school has children from poor families (\$2,000 or less annual income) the public school that receives aid from this bill must provide them "special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment)" in which private school pupils can participate.

Other aids to private school pupils are school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials. The supplementary educational centers and services are also available to all school children in a community.

Question. Through what channels or agencies will these aids be available to private school pupils?

Answer. Only through public agencies. The bill requires that the local educational agency will maintain administration and

control of the programs available to private school children. It also assures that the title to any property constructed or purchased shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer the funds and property for public educational purposes.

According to the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, under the provision for library resources, textbooks and other aids available to all school children, the bill assures that the funds "will not enure to the enrichment or benefit of any private institution" by the following:

1. Library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials are to be made available to children and teachers and not to institutions.

2. Such materials are made available on a loan basis only.

3. Public authority must retain title and administrative control over such materials.

4. Such material must be that approved for use by public school authority in the State.

5. Books and material must not supplant those being provided children but must supplement library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials to assure that the legislation will furnish increased opportunities for learning.

For the supplementary educational centers and services the grants are made to a public education agency, the property is in a public agency and the program is administered by the public agency.

Question. Why is there such widespread belief that the new education bill gives aid to parochial schools as well as to public schools?

Answer. There are at least four clear reasons for this confusion. First, the bill approaches education aid on a new basis. It is a poverty bill as well as an education bill, and it is aimed at children rather than institutions. This shift from the traditional thought patterns of education is not quickly made by those who have thought only of aid to schools.

Second, the news media are not always precise in the language used in reporting. In efforts to simplify complicated matters and to shorten lengthy explanations it is easy to use misleading terminology. Such efforts have resulted in a misrepresentation of the bill in some instances.

Third, some of those who are opposed to Federal aid to education have sought to use the religious issue to defeat the bill. When it was evident that all other tactics were failing, the opponents attempted to sidetrack it by the charge it provided aid to parochial schools. They did not succeed in convincing the religious leaders, the education leaders, or the political leaders of the Nation.

Fourth, the administration of the act will require private schools to cooperate with public schools to some extent if their pupils are to receive their aids. In some instances they may create community tensions and abuses if either the school board or the private school interests press for undue advantage.

Question. What has been the position of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs on the new education bill?

Answer. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs neither endorses nor opposes Federal aid to education. Neither can nor does the committee attempt to speak for all Baptists on such issues.

However, the Baptist agency played an important role in this legislation. From the first it was evident that Congress would pass an education bill this year. The problem was to get the best bill possible from a church-state viewpoint. The executive director of the committee, C. Emmanuel Carlson, testified at hearings before the Senate and

here is deep doubt and anxiety about the course we are taking. This is why he knows that the ice is very thin.

The popular doubt and anxiety have provoked a great debate which ought not to be vulgarized and degraded by the use of epithets like dove and hawk. This debate cannot be suspended while American policy is, as it is today, still unsettled and in the making. The debate on Vietnam has already brought about a very considerable improvement in our policy.

When the debate began, Mr. Rusk was saying that our war aim was that the North Vietnamese must "stop doing what they are doing," without specifying exactly what they must do or not do and what we would regard as sufficient proof they had done it. This was a demand for unconditional surrender, and it was far away from the President's Baltimore speech which offered, for the first time, "unconditional discussions." We have come a long way from the position of 3 months ago when we said that we did not think there was anything to negotiate about. For now the avowed purpose of our policy is to induce Hanoi to negotiate.

The debate, therefore, has not been in vain, and it must continue in order to clarify our thinking about where and when and how we want to bring about a cease-fire, and what, in the ensuing negotiations, we hope to achieve in Indochina. We are still far from such a clarification, even among the small circle of the President's principal advisers, and obviously the country as a whole is groping for information and for enlightenment.

As part of that debate, I should like to say something about a powerful and moving leading editorial in the Washington Post on Monday. It is called "Anguish of Power." Its theme is that once a nation has achieved great power, such as Great Britain did in the 19th century and as the United States has now, it "must live in anguish." For "no country can have great power and a quiet conscience."

Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown: No doubt it is true that great power and a quiet conscience do not easily or for long go together. Where I differ from the Washington Post is not about that. We cannot, and we should not if we could, return to the isolation which we practiced before the two World Wars, and imagine that we are returning to the age of our innocence. My thesis is that we must not make the mistake of jumping from isolationism into globalism, and that this is what the Washington Post is in fact saying we need to do.

It is true that this country cannot admit disinterest in any crisis. But what this country must learn to do is to measure how much it can afford to intervene in any crisis, and to distinguish between crises which affect its vital interests and those which do not. Great Britain in the 19th century did not regard it as a duty to intervene when a fire broke out—as, for example, in our Civil War, in the Franco-Prussian War, in the Balkan wars, in the Russo-Japanese War. What I reject is the idea that because the United States must take an interest when there is any breach of the peace, it must therefore be the global policeman or, as the Washington Post puts it, the global fire department.

A mature great power will make measured and limited use of its power. It will eschew the theory of a global and universal duty which not only commits it to unending wars of intervention but intoxicates its thinking with the illusion that it is a crusader for righteousness, that each war is a war to end all war.

Since in this generation we have become a great power, I am in favor of learning to behave like a great power, of getting rid of the globalism which would not only en-

tangle us everywhere but is based on the totally vain notion that if we do not set the world in order, no matter what the price, we cannot live in the world safely. If we examine this idea thoroughly, we shall see that it is nothing but the old isolationism of our innocence in a new form. Then we thought we had to preserve our purity by withdrawal from the ugliness of great power politics. Now we sometimes talk as if we could preserve our purity only by policing the globe. But in the real world we shall have to learn to live as a great power which defends itself and makes its way among other great powers.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1965]

ANGUISH OF POWER

This administration, and no doubt its successors far into the future, will have to deal with a deep-seated revulsion against the great power role of the United States. Now there is criticism of that role in South Vietnam; in subsequent crises it will be against the execution of a great power role in other areas.

Those who express resentment at and opposition to the employment of force in southeast Asia include some of the country's foremost liberals and intellectuals as well as academic and campus leaders of lesser eminence. Some of course oppose the policy on practical grounds. Some oppose it because of a belief that Chinese Communist power in the area is irresistible. Some are against it because they see it is an excessive commitment to a "Balkan" war that may weaken or divert forces needed in more important theaters of conflict. Some criticize it because they disagree as to the real national interest in the area. Some deplore it because they simply think we cannot achieve our objectives or carry out our commitments.

The largest opposition, however, no doubt comes from those who instinctively rebel against this country's great power role. They oppose the burden of great power as many of the British opposed it for nearly 300 years. But Great Britain for a long period could not escape the anguish that comes with the very possession of power. However large the crowds that gathered in Trafalgar Square to shout against the decisions of successive ministries to commit British power in Africa and Asia and America (or against the failure to commit it) no Parliament could relieve Great Britain of the anguish of great power, no monarch could rescue it from the burdens that go with the possession of predominant force. It was not governments that the people opposed; but the fate that put into the hands of the leaders of one nation the leverage to influence the course of events and the destiny of nations.

And this is the real misery of the mighty. Once power descends upon a people it can no longer achieve national peace of mind, even if it can achieve peace in the sense of avoiding war. From the moment its power position is achieved, the nation must live in anguish. It must endure the anguish that attends the application of force, arising out of all the normal revulsions against the resort to violence and against the imposition of pain and misery to achieve political results in a world where force or the use of force is the chief arbiter of nations. Or it must endure the anguish that attends the failure to use force where its employment would work for the national salvation or the preservation of peace. No country can have great power and a quiet conscience. Its people and its leaders must suffer either the reproaches of having used force or the reproaches for having failed to use it. Life alternates between the miseries of Vietnams and Munichs and is seldom free from one or the other.

There is no way a party or a President or

a Congress can deliver a people from this discomfort. It was inescapable in the days of British power; it is more inevitable now when no crisis can be so remote or so little connected with the national interest that it can be simply overlooked. This country cannot admit disinterest in any crisis. It is vain to cry that Alabama is for Alabamians, Africa for Africans, Asia for Asians, America for Americans. We are influenced by every act of injustice and tyranny that takes place everywhere in the globe; and every act of tyranny and injustice that takes place here has its influence everywhere in the world. It is not one world in the happy sense that Wendell Willkie imagined it; but it is one world, nevertheless. And its oneness is such that no one can light a fire anywhere in it but that the nation with the biggest fire department has to decide whether to use it or not to use it. And out of that choice enormous consequences for good or evil must flow.

Such is our burden, such our plan, and such our anguish. When, as a people, we accept the fact that it is unavoidable and inescapable, the level of debate over what we should or should not do in each recurring crisis will rise. Each of our decisions to use force or to fail to use force is filled with potential pain and injury for millions. This is the anguish that goes with great power. No one can deliver us from it.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, on the subject of Vietnam and the President's press conference held yesterday, I should like to read into the RECORD headlines from three great eastern metropolitan daily newspapers, reflecting their views on the press conference, which views I am sure too many readers take instead of reading the remainder of the news article.

I would hope that the printer of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would feel that under the rules by which we operate, it might be appropriate to place headlines around these headlines.

The first is from the Washington Post of today, and reads as follows:

JOHNSON REAFFIRMS OFFER TO TALK PEACE INVITES DOUBTING NATIONS TO TEST U.S. SINCERITY

The second headline is from this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer and reads as follows:

JOHNSON DARES REDS TO TAKE UP PEACE OFFER, BARS WAR LETUP DEFENDS RAIDS, JABS AT CRITICS

The third headline reporting on the same press conference, published in the New York Times, reads as follows:

JOHNSON RENEWS BID ON VIETNAM; DEFENDS BOMBING

REPEATS HIS OFFER TO CONFER WITH ANY GOVERNMENT WITHOUT CONDITIONS—PEACE HOPES STRESSED

Mr. President, I ask the question: What newspapers do you read?

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his courtesy in yielding to me.

DEATH OF EDWARD R. MURROW

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, "good night and good luck"—these were the words with which Edward R. Murrow concluded his radio and television program for more than 20 years. Born in the South, raised in the West, working in the East, he was truly all American. Ed Murrow's career was a unique one. It was a career based on a high regard

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 28, 196

for honesty, modesty, integrity, and forthright reporting. It was a career underlined by courage, a keen sense of the truth, and the need of the American people to know the truth. Ed Murrow served the American people, first as their eyes and their ears, as their witness to events which shook the world—then as interpreter to the world of American policies and American life. It was this sense of duty and a desire to get the truth across which motivated Murrow to leave his high-paying position as newscaster and analyst and to accept the difficult and demanding challenge to be Director of the U. S. Information Agency, a position which offered one-tenth his salary at CBS. At USIA Ed Murrow made a great contribution. He worked tirelessly to upgrade the quality of our information program abroad and for some months he did it while fighting the early stages of lung cancer.

Ed Murrow was forced to leave his post at USIA last year. His fight had become his full-time job. It was, perhaps, the only job he ever undertook in which he was unsuccessful. His own words serve best right now to express my feeling at the passing of Edward R. Murrow: "Good night—and good luck—and thanks."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in its May 1965 issue has published an editorial, written by the able president of the NALC, Jerome J. Keating, on the life of our late colleague, Senator Olin D. Johnston. I believe the editorial should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON
(Editorial, from Jerome J. Keating)

Early Easter Sunday morning, my telephone rang; it was Bill Guldridge, staff director of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In a tearchoked voice, he declared, "Our Senator is dead; he passed away at 4:21 this morning."

Yes, "Our Senator is dead." If the letter carriers of America ever had a Senator, it was the six-foot-three South Carolinian—the man with the big heart and the astute mind—the man who was responsible for more postal legislation than any man who had ever lived.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, said simply: "My staunchest friend in the Senate is gone." The letter carriers of America can well re-echo that sentiment.

The Columbia, (S.C.) Record paid Senator Johnston a marvelous tribute:

"Son of a tenant farmer and early in life a laborer in the textile mills of South Carolina, Olin Dewitt Johnston never forgot his heritage. Throughout his long and colorful career of service to State and Nation, the Senator never disremembered what it is like to be born with a pewter, rather than a silver spoon. He never forgot the little people of South Carolina.

"They were his joy and his strength. And he was their joy and their strength.

"He knew and he understood, from firsthand, the privations of the poor, the constant struggle for survival of the textile worker, the pain of the Federal employee ignored by the sprawling bureaucracy, and the debilitating toil of the farmer patiently coercing a living out of Carolina soil. He knew. And these people knew that Olin Johnston knew—and cared.

"Throughout his governmental service, whether as State representative, governor or Senator, he championed the causes of the little people. Born to a tenant farm, nourished in a textile mill, politically educated in the great depression, he became an ardent New Dealer under Franklin Roosevelt and remained adamantly dedicated to its principles until his death.

"In the Senate, he was a good party man—one who knew the rules of 'the greatest club in the world,' understood its rules and played by its rules. He was universally respected. On his last visit to the Senate, he was warmly welcomed by both sides of the aisle—with words of genuine affection, concern and praise from men of widely separated political attitudes.

"Today, South Carolinians paid due homage to the Senator, as his body rested in state in the State House. Tomorrow, he will be buried in the upstate region that nurtured him.

"And a change has come over our State with his passing. No longer will the textile workers greet the tall, hulking figure with the deep voice who knew them by their Christian names. No longer will the people of the State see him rise, shake his jowls and in characteristic southern speech intone, 'My fellow South Carolinians.'

"His fellow South Carolinians, who showed their esteem for the Senator by electing him to a series of offices matched by few in our history, will miss the big man from the Piedmont."

The letter carriers will miss him; the Federal employees and the little people all over America will miss this wonderful man of great courage and determination. Alvin Haith, his letter carrier at Kensington, Md., traveled all the way from Kensington to attend the funeral at Spartanburg. "You just don't know what your coming here means to me," declared Mrs. Gladys Johnston on seeing Carrier Haith.

On Monday, the body of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON lay in state in the beautiful old South Carolina Capitol, in the Capital city of the State where Senator JOHNSTON had served longer as Governor than any other man. He was the first man ever to lay in state in the capitol building.

All day long a steady stream of people, young and old, well dressed and poorly dressed, people of all races, passed the bier. On the face of each was reflected signs of sorrow. Many, remembering some kind deed, wept openly.

At 3:30 p.m., 50 Columbia letter carriers in uniform, led by Branch President Ray Lemmons, having completed their day's work, passed solemnly, soberly, and tearfully by the bier of their great champion. The loyal and faithful Bill Johnston, the Senator's brother, who never left his side, greeted every one of them.

At 5:30 p.m., the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson came to Columbia to console Mrs. Johnston and the Senator's family, and to pay their last respects to his long-time Senate colleague and his faithful supporter. Governor Donald Russell, in a few touching words, paid tribute to his friend. Chaplain George Mutze of the South Carolina State Senate prayed and offered spiritual consolation. The Capitol was crowded with mourners, and the people lined the steps outside. Many letter carriers from nearby towns hurried in to attend the services in Columbia.

Early Tuesday morning the body was taken to Spartanburg, to the church where the Senator had long worshipped. The Vice President, and Mrs. Humphrey, headed large group of Senators who came from Washington to attend the funeral. Postmaster General John Gronouski and Deputy Postmaster General Fred Belen accompanied the Vice President and his party. The State's congressional delegation and State officials were in the church; the main church was packed with mourners; a second chaperone was crowded, and the steps to the church and sidewalk in front were filled with people who could not get in. Scattered through the reverent audience were many letter carriers from North and South Carolina.

The Spartanburg Journal reported: "Inside the church, floral wreaths from far and near were banked around the altar and two walls. In the lobby one simple wreath of red carnations, yellow chrysanthemums, and Easter lilies in green fern stood out from the others."

"It bore this message: 'Letter Carriers Branch 628, Spartanburg.' It was mute testimony to the popularity of the late Senator among letter carriers throughout the United States. He had served as chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee for years and, as such, wielded considerable influence in postal affairs."

Following the funeral at the Southside Baptist Church, the body was taken to Honea Path, South Carolina, for interment. It was characteristic of the humility and faithfulness of the Johnstons that the body was returned to a little cemetery in the small community of Honea Path, where Senator Johnston had lived as a boy.

A MARVELOUS CAREER

The career of Senator Olin D. Johnston is indeed one to inspire hope and raise the ambitions of every young man in America. Here was a boy, the son of a tenant farmer. At the age of 9, he started to work in the mill. He studied hard; graduated with a bachelor's degree; later secured a master's degree; and finally secured his law degree. He was elected to the legislature, served as Governor of his State longer than any other man, and finally became U.S. Senator. In his senatorial campaigns, he was consistently opposed by the strongest candidates in the State. In his last election he turned back the Governor of the State in the primary and defeated a strong Republican candidate in the general election. He never forgot the people, and they never forgot him.

Senator Johnston served with the Rainbow Division in World War I. In college and in the service, he boxed as a heavyweight. Indeed, he had a fighting heart—a man 68 years of age who survived two major operations within a period of 3 months, and was indeed a man with a fighting heart. So engrossed in the Senate and his responsibilities was he that he returned to his senatorial tasks between operations.

FRIEND OF THE POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

To me, the death of Senator Johnston is a great loss. A kindly man, he always had time for our problems. One citizen attending the Senator's funeral at Spartanburg told a reporter: "I was down on my luck; I went to Washington. Our other Senator was too busy to see me, but Senator Johnston saw me and took care of my problems." That was typical of this great Senator.

Senator Olin D. Johnston came to Washington in 1945. I came to Washington in 1945. I have had the honor and privilege of associating with him during his entire career in the Senate. One of the first major legislative efforts in which he was involved was the 1948 amendments to the Retirement Act. That was epoch-making legislation.

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8491

The Senator stood up like a trojan in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. He was a central figure in our national convention and in our meetings held in Washington. Frequently he was accompanied by his good wife Gladys, and on some occasions by his fine children. A convention was not a convention without the Senator.

Legislatively, he worked closely with President Doherty and myself, and, in more recent years, with Vice President Rademacher as well.

Without a doubt he sponsored and guided more postal and Federal employee legislation through the Congress than any man who had ever lived. The very last deed that he performed as a Member of the Senate was to introduce S. 1667, a bill to transfer back to Congress the exclusive right to set rates on parcel post.

The last increase for retirees enacted in 1962 would not have become a law were it not for the Senator. The House had passed the pay bill, but the increase for annuitants was tied up in the Rules Committee. Senator Johnston amended the pay bill by attaching the annuity increase to it, and thus it became law.

Frequently during his career as chairman of the Senate committee, the astute Senator resorted to unusual strategy to secure the enactment of a bill. Legislation during the past 20 years in the House has frequently been bottled up in the committees. Senator Johnston would take a minor bill that had passed the House, amend it by adding the major bill to it, and the bill would then go to conference.

The Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, in a sometimes complimentary and sometimes critical editorial, commenting on his political success, declared: "The overly frequent pay raises he got for the employees did not hurt either."

The same editorial stated, "But it is safe to say that South Carolina has not had a more effective lawmaker in Washington in many years."

Senator Johnston was kind, he never spoke harshly of anyone; he was an able legislator, universally liked, most considerate, and a great champion of the postal employees. He will be missed and mourned. To his fine family—his faithful wife Gladys, his son Olin, Jr., his two lovely daughters Mrs. Sallie Scott and Elizabeth, we extend our most sincere sympathy.

Undoubtedly Senator A. S. (MIKE) MURDOCH will become chairman of the committee. He has worked closely with Senator Johnston, he is a good friend of the employees, and will closely parallel the policies of his predecessor.

Gov. Donald Russell has stepped down from the governorship to assume the office of U.S. Senator. Suffice it to say, he was a close friend of Senator Olin D. Johnston.

PEOPLE'S WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues, as well as of other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to a somewhat different and provocative viewpoint on the current struggle in Vietnam. Its expositor is Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, U.S. Air Force, retired, who as a result of several years' service in the Philippines and southeast Asia has earned the reputation of being one of the most knowledgeable Americans on the subject of Communist "wars of national liberation" and counterinsurgency. General Lansdale is presently a consultant to the staff of Food for Peace, at the White House.

No. 75 — 18

General Lansdale does not question our presence in Vietnam, nor does he call for American withdrawal from Vietnam and southeast Asia. If anything, I think it is fair to say that he does not feel that we are involved as much as we should be in Vietnam. His principal criticism of our present policy in Vietnam is perhaps best summed up in the question: "Do we do something halfway: give a man a gun to defend himself, give him means to fill his belly, and let him shift for himself when it comes to realizing his great hope for man's liberty?" General Lansdale argues that the United States must help the Vietnamese arm themselves politically, as well as physically and materially. He cites as the major unused weapon of this "people's war" our ideology which is embodied in the opening paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

General Lansdale most recently expressed his viewpoint on Vietnam in a talk at the Principia Conference on Vietnam, in Elsah, Ill., on April 9, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that General Lansdale's interesting and stimulating address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK AT PRINCPIA CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM,
ELSAH, ILL.

(By Edward G. Lansdale, major general, USAF, retired)

I

It is time that you and I and other Americans become pragmatic about Vietnam. A truly pragmatic American would insist that we do today what will help us tomorrow.

From this pragmatic viewpoint, we almost seem to have forgotten why we are in Vietnam. To be sure, we have said why. We have talked it up big. Some Americans even have talked it down big. Yet, the great challenge given the United States by events in Vietnam largely has gone unmet by practical or effective American deeds.

Since this challenge won't go away, just because we duck accepting it, let us get it out into the open here and now, look at it hard, and then dare to consider meeting it.

II

The great challenge given to us in Vietnam is political. Essentially, it is this: Can the Vietnamese win their freedom while they fail to agree on what freedom is—and fail to start governing themselves in a way that takes them toward that freedom? If they cannot, then should we Americans remain aloof from this political heart of the struggle and confine our most generous and dedicated help in Vietnam to military and socio-economic assistance? Or rather, should we Americans give equally generous and dedicated help to the Vietnamese in their heartfelt longing to achieve ways to govern themselves, within their own truths and with a real degree of stability, while they set forth clearly the premise of the freedom they most desire for themselves?

Put it another way, it can be said that our side in Vietnam outnumbers, outguns, and outspends the enemy. Shouldn't we now make a real effort to outthink the enemy on the actual battleground among the people of Vietnam? This means helping the Vietnamese find their own true cause to fight for, much more than helping them fight against something. Such positive, in contrast to negative, help could well include sympathetic encouragement and assistance

in the step-by-step development of a representative and responsive political system of Vietnamese origin. This would create something of their own to which the Vietnamese could pledge, willingly and freely, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Such work would fill a gap which has been the despair of Vietnamese, Americans, and other free people in Vietnam. It would put the war upon a sound moral and political footing. Given true political meaning, the military, psychological, and economic actions used to win the moral goal would increase a hundredfold in their effect on breaking the will of the enemy. A Vietnamese cause, with an attainable national goal closest to the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese, would not only give the Vietnamese something worth everything to defend. It also would be a goal desired even by those now under the control of Communist masters, one that would give them just cause to leave the ranks of the Communists and join their brothers on our side. This is true strategy for a "peoples' war" such as the Communists have sought to wage. It directly confronts the main weapon of the Communists—their political action—with a superior action of our own. If we employ it truly, there is little doubt about victory for the cause of freedom. Further, the struggle would be fought on the terms of freemen, not on those of the Communists.

This strategy deals with the hard inner core of the struggle in the world today, in Vietnam, in the so-called wars of national liberation elsewhere. The basic conflict is between the way we, the free, look at man and the way the Communists look at man. We see man as an individual, endowed by his Creator with "certain inalienable rights." The Communists see man as a cipher of the state, a materialist zero without a creator. So, what do we do in this basic conflict? Do we profess "self-evident truths" for ourselves alone? Do we permit the Communists to beguile, coerce, or otherwise rob a man of the true heritage we say he has, and let them make him a part of the Communist machine—while we keep silent about this true heritage, not help him come into it to the full extent of our ability? Do we do something halfway: give a man a gun to defend himself, give him means to fill his belly, and let him shift for himself when it comes to realizing his great hope for man's liberty? I don't believe we can do only this and still maintain our own freedom, strong and honest and lasting.

III

Now, this challenge has come to us at a moment of history. We should recognize that man's history is full of political challenges which were met by the world's leading power in each era. The challenges were met to keep the peace, as the leading power defined that peace. The great khans, Alexander, Tamerlane, Rome, Spain, and Britain all had their time of leadership and of keeping the peace, their style. Along with military strength which gained and enforced their leadership, along with economic measures which gave it commercial meaning, there also was political action by the leading power, to provide his means of control. Our name for this political action is "colonialism." The world leader in the past simply made colonies out of lands and peoples abroad, imposing upon them political systems, laws, language, modes of justice that were his own.

Today, the United States finds itself in the position of being the world's leading power. Yet, we Americans are opposed to colonialism and colonial methods for many reasons, including the fact that we too were once a colony and rebelled against the concept. Lyndon Johnson, with his gift for

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 28, 1965

census, expressed out national feelings well in his inaugural address last January. The President said: "Our Nation's course is abundantly clear. We aspire to nothing that belongs to others. We seek no dominion over our fellow man, but man's dominion over tyranny and misery."

However, at this moment of man's history, we are not alone in the world. There are two Communist powers, the Soviet Union and China, who singly and jointly challenge our world leadership. On their part, they are quite brazen about using political action to gain control of other nations. They use a form of old power play, the old colonialism, in modern dress. A mention of Hungary and Tibet will make this point. These once-independent countries, conquered by neighboring Communists and made into satellites, tried to gain independence in much the same way as the American colonies did in 1776. The stamping out of these recent revolutions by foreign troops under the Communists were plain acts of colonial imperialism in the ugliest historic sense. Further, the expansion of the Communist empire has been an active fact of life in our time. For example, back when many of today's faculty members were students themselves, just before the outbreak of World War II, there were a little less than 200 million people under direct Communist rule. Today, the number of people under direct Communist rule has grown to almost 1,100 million people. (In contrast, people on our side, clearly committed to the cause of freedom, number some 752 million. This doesn't count many millions in Africa, India, the United Arab Republic, and Indonesia whose politics await the future.)

While the original Communist takeovers of Hungary, Tibet, and several other countries were plain conquests by use of conventional military force, the current methods of Communist expansion are more subtle. They entitle these methods as "wars of national liberation." We see them as "Communist subversive insurgency." Vietnam is today's most active example.

In the Asian method of Communist subversive insurgency, a national liberation political group is established at a remote base. This political group is given the image of a people's movement by naming members who allegedly represent big sectors of the national population—the farmers, the youth, the women, the workers, the students, and so on. Added to the political cadres are military cadres who are specialists in guerrilla warfare, and who will build a military apparatus upon the political footing provided by the political cadres. The "remote base" where this starts coming out in the open usually means a camp located far enough from centers of population to avoid immediate detection or access by the country's forces of law and order.

This political-military force then acts to gain control of the people on the land, by attraction or coercion as required. It is a step-by-step operation, first in the villages and hamlets closest to the base, and then ever widening. Nuclei are sent to establish more bases, to start the same process in other regions. Secret agents are sent to infiltrate centers of population and government organizations. The Asian Communist slogan which goes, "first the mountains, then the countryside, then the cities" is a good thumbnail description of the process. It is considerably different than the Soviet method of working with the proletariat in cities or of Soviet defensive partisan warfare.

Along with selling nationalistic goals, selected for the greatest local appeal, Asian Communists also act to destroy both the credibility and the instruments of the nation's government among the local people. In brief, they act to create a momentary vacuum of anarchy, to permit them to fill this vacuum with their own governing appa-

ratus. The anarchy is created by destructive means: the character assassination of national leaders by psychological means, isolating the countryside from the city by strangling lines of communication through ambushing and cutting highways and railways, provoking government forces into acts against the people (such as hiding in villages and forcing the villagers to stay there while the Communists start a battle with government forces, and the liquidation of local people representing authority—such as village headmen, judges, public health and public works officials, policemen, even schoolteachers, and at times the families of these people. Many thousands of such public servants have been murdered by the Communists in Vietnam.

I suspect that Mao Tse Tung had a knowing look on his face when he told Edgar Snow recently that Americans seem to ignore "the decisive political fact that * * * governments cut off from the masses could not win against wars of national liberation." Mao had a big hand in developing the cynical, brutal Asian Communist method of cutting off the people from their government.

The trouble is, this method has a big appeal to ambitious people in a number of countries. It has become quite an export item to the Western Hemisphere and Africa, where there are some would-be leaders eager to try it. As General Giap, the Communist military leader in Hanoi, said not long ago: "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time * * *. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, this means that it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

The forces of freedom must be vigilant about this vital facet of Communist action. In Malaysia, where Sukarno is trying to use this method his own way, the Malaysian Government has had a long, bitter experience in facing up to the challenge, from Communist guerrilla days. A recent warning by Dato Ghazali bin Shafie, who is Permanent Secretary to the Malaysian External Affairs Ministry, is worth noting. Dato Ghazali told the Malaysians: "It is the height of folly to assume that superior military expertise and superior firepower alone are decisive. To overlook the importance of political action is to miss the bus completely * * * Malaysia will endure * * * so long as the national will, which is the active expression of growing national unity, can withstand the pressures from within and without * * *. There is no alternative. It is of paramount importance to anticipate tensions and stresses wherever they are likely to appear between the people and the Government."

IV

So far, then, I have pointed out that a great challenge exists for us in Vietnam, have done my best to describe it, to tell how it came to be, and to sketch in the major pressures facing us. Now we reach the hard part. What do we want to do about it? What can we do about it? What is practical, feasible for the United States to do—with in our own political heritage, within the talents of our people, within the goal of an honorable peaceful world such as we seek?

Noted journalists such as Joseph Kraft and C. L. Sulzberger have analyzed our U.S. organization and efforts in Vietnam and have concluded, in brief, that the United States does not have in Vietnam what it takes to meet the Communist political challenge there. Mr. Sulzberger wrote to the New York Times from Danang, Vietnam, in March: "Today, we acknowledge we have not found a formula to frustrate communism's brilliant revolutionary warfare techniques as such. Our governmental social and military systems are not devised for this. Never having had an empire, we possess no large cadres of civil servants experienced in Asia. We

cannot dynamically export our ideology, which is not dynamic. And our warmaking capacity is founded on highly technical equipment and strategy unsuited to guerrilla engagements."

Assuming that there is some validity in such analyses, that we do not now have the people nor the organization in Vietnam to meet the great political challenge given us, we must also assume that the challenge won't go away just because it is unmet by us. Military actions in North Vietnam, the most skillful diplomatic moves, mammoth economic development projects such as the one for the Mekong Basin—even if successful in stopping the Communists from waging guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam and in giving a giant boost to the material well-being of the people in the region—won't by themselves end the Communist revolutionary process among the people. Like the magical invisible clothing for the emperor, in the child's tale, no matter how we say we see the problem, the central figure still remains naked. It is there. It is the truth we must face, sooner or later.

Further, there at the heart of the challenge is that question of ideology. As an American who served the United States for many years in Asia—served, if you will, as a public servant not to an empire but to a democracy, and served long tours in areas of active Communist revolution—I can say flatly that our political beliefs, our ideology, are far more dynamic, far more appealing in Asia than anything the Communists can put forward. Every time we have given our fundamental principles a fair chance, have stayed true to them, have practiced what what we preached, our ideology has licked the Communists hands down. I have seen this happen on the spot at critical moments of history. If the Communists are beating us in Vietnam on so basic an issue, then I must join Dato Ghazali of Malaysia and say we are missing the bus completely.

One of our difficulties is that we confuse ourselves when we talk about politics, political action, and ideology once we leave our own shores. Different Americans define these words differently, when abroad. Yet, our basic political beliefs are set forth plainly and interpretation really rests on the courage of our convictions. Our basic political beliefs are there, for all to read, in the opening paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence, as followed by specific guidance in our Bill of Rights. We have, in these, a great promise coupled with its principled guidance. They form an ideology of dynamic universality, as alive today as when conceived, and close to the hearts of men of good will throughout the world. Although our expression of higher human concepts grew out of our own Graeco-Judaic-Christian background, the ethics expressed are in close harmony with the great teachings of Asia, including Confucianism. It passes understanding why any American tries to put this ideology of ours on the shelf, unused, in the face of an admittedly Godless, a dialectical materialism, and, instead, substitutes a materialism of our own to meet the thrust of communism in dubious battle. This is wagging war on grounds of our enemy's choosing, when we could be in our true place, fighting the good fight of our own choosing.

Too often, American political action abroad is seen as being limited to diplomatic negotiations between governments, or promoting the pro forma copying of parliamentary democracy in the image of the United States, or in a sort of self-righteous scolding of foreign leaders for behavior not conforming to our idea of what it should be, or even in charting how a native bureaucracy should work in an unwitting adherence to Parkinson's Law. We ourselves are to blame. We have not assigned the mission for true American political work abroad to any of our Government services, nor have trained any of our

access to the unpublished files of the Department, the revised regulations on which were considered in the committee's report for 1963 and were summarized in the scholarly journals. Here the committee strongly recommends that access for a calendar year be granted on the present restricted basis as soon as the initial Foreign Relations volume for that year is issued.

Once again the committee acknowledges the many courtesies it received during its meeting from officials in the Department, especially Secretary Dean Rusk, Under Secretary for Political Affairs W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs James L. Greenfield, and Executive Director of the Bureau of Public Affairs Francis T. Murphy. In behalf of the organizations its members represent—the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Society of International Law—it expresses once more its confidence in the scholarly integrity of the Foreign Relations series. It pays tribute to William M. Franklin, director of the Historical Office, to S. Everett Gleason, editor of Foreign Relations, and to their associates for dedication and loyalty in pursuing an important public and scholarly task under disheartening conditions. It urges Congress and the Department to take immediate steps to insure that Foreign Relations will be in the future, as it has been in the past, a publication which does credit to the nation and provides enlightenment for all its citizens.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Bishop, Jr., University of Michigan;¹ Robert H. Ferrell, Indiana University;² Philip E. Mosely, Columbia University;³ Robert E. Osgood, the Johns Hopkins University;⁴ Robert B. Stewart, Tufts University;⁵ Robert R. Wilson, Duke University;⁶ Richard W. Leopold, chairman, Northwestern University.⁷

VIETNAM: AN ENGLISH VIEW

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all the evidence which comes from the Afro-Asian world bears one lesson for us: that the white Western powers must learn to play a new, nonmilitary role in that area. This advice applies to the European countries, as well as to the United States. In an article which was published in the highly respected English newspaper, The Guardian, Patrick Keatley reported that Western military intervention in that area only serves to benefit the cause of the Communist Chinese. In his article, Mr. Keatley summarized the Afro-Asian viewpoint as follows:

The era for a Western military presence is past, though there are still Afro-Asian leaders who have not absorbed the lesson. Now is an era, not for Tommies, but for teachers and technicians; not for bombs and bases, but for books and businessmen.

Mr. Keatley concluded:

In the Afro-Asia of 1965, the wisest rule for those heading east of Suez bearing burdens is that they should not be in uniform and not carrying guns. It is a lesson that Andrei Gromyko and Charles de Gaulle have both quite evidently learned.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

¹ Representing the American Historical Association.

² Representing the American Political Science Association.

³ Representing the American Society of International Law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIRPLING'S COUNSEL
(By Patrick Keatley)

"Pan-Africanism has neither army nor budget."—Sir ROY WELENSKY.

"We must give active support to the national independence movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; to the righteous struggle in all countries throughout the world."—MAO TSE-TUNG.

There is a world of wisdom to be gained from the verbal confrontation above. The pathetic thing is that Rhodesia's fallen leader made his cynical assertion as recently as December 1962, during a congratulatory banquet in Johannesburg; whereas Chairman Mao had already spoken his prophetic warning in Peiping 6 years earlier.

And the single, stunning political fact of the world of Afro-Asia today is that nationalism no longer lacks for budget nor battalions. This is the thing that strikes the Western visitor now who journeys east or south of Suez. Indeed, Sir Roy Welensky was already out of date (not for the first time) when he made that remark 2 years ago, though the process of boosting Afro-Asian firepower with Moscow muscle and Peiping potency has accelerated since then.

This is not to rejoice at his discomfiture, for I do not. Nor am I one of those who applaud with silent satisfaction at each new diplomatic success in Afro-Asia by China or the Soviet Union. It is just that as an observer, traveling in those lands today, I am bound—in spite of a private faith in liberal capitalism—to recognize and report blunt facts. And the basic fact is that the white man has, today, largely lost the diplomatic initiative.

This applies to the Russians almost as much as ourselves and, if Peiping overplays its hand, it will apply to the Han dynasts too. There is a world of feeling in the sharp comment of President Ben Bella when he said recently that he will not tolerate that "at any price Algeria should become the pawn in a dispute which seems to us, at the very least, infuriating."

That observation came not long after Mr. Chou En-lai had wound up a Pan-African tour with the remark that "Africa today is ripe for revolution." So there is a certain caution in the back of the mind of any African leader when he negotiates with Mr. Ho Ying in Dar, Mr. Wang Yu Tien in Nairobi, or any of the other able ambassadors that People's China has assigned in the past 5 years to the 16 new diplomatic missions she has opened on that continent. (Six more will be operating before the Second Afro-Asian Conference opens on June 29 in Algiers.)

But the thing that drives the Afro-Asian nationalist straight into the able, avuncular arms of Mr. Ho and Mr. Wang is when we in the West give way to an atavistic reflex that dates from Bismarck and Canning and the Congress of Vienna. Instinctively, like aging circus horses going into a familiar routine, we have one instant reaction when we hear the thump of the Afro-Asian nationalist drum; alert aircraft/send soldiers/build bases. The harvest of headlines—as I saw them recently in the press of India and Pakistan—makes curious, outdated reading east of Suez: Airlift from Lyneham, RAF Rakes Harib, Greenjackets Go In.

HEADY WINE

These headlines may come as heady wine to some diehards at Westminster but there is only one other place where they can conceivably be received with satisfaction. That is in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Peiping where Mr. Wang—now in Nairobi—was until recently director of the West Asia and African Department.

The thing was put most vividly to me by the Indonesian Foreign Minister, Dr. Subandrio, when we met by chance in the plane from Lahore to Karachi just over a fortnight ago. We were introduced by Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Mr. Zulfikar Bhutto, his host for the political mission then in progress. (This has since been followed by a trade mission and a handsome loan, at low interest, to help Indonesia buy nonmilitary goods in Pakistan). Mr. Bhutto, having made it clear that his country values its Commonwealth links with Britain and with Malaysia, then prompted his guest to speak.

What Dr. Subandrio had to say took some time, but in sum it came to the simple point that "We don't want British bases in Asia and we don't want white men in uniform on Asian soil." I started to argue the Malaysian case, pointing out that Tunku Abdul Rahman had negotiated the Singapore bases and the Anglo-Australian-New Zealand troop commitments as prime minister of a state that had—at the time of the 1963 London conference—been sovereign for 6 years.

But Dr. Subandrio's basic point was simple and he came back to it with Asian obduracy: whatever the reasons, these are simply the soldiers of a European colonial power on Asian soil; and the concept is politically out of date and emotionally unacceptable in the Asia of 1965. He did not want in stress the racial element, which was for him clearly a distasteful argument to employ. But it came through just the same, and when Mr. Bhutto joined in the conversation at the end (having carefully remained out of it so that I should hear the undiluted Indonesian case) the Afro-Asian view was summed up for me by the two Foreign Ministers this way:

"The era for a Western military presence is past, though there are still Afro-Asian leaders who have not absorbed the lesson. Now is an era, not for Tommies but for teachers and technicians; not for bombs and bases but for books and businessmen."

The same thought has been expressed in the past few days by the Vice President of Kenya, Mr. Oginga Odinga, who can hardly be described as a friend of the West and has spent many weeks in Peiping in the course of half a dozen visits since 1960. On a personal plane, he and I clash ideologically each time we meet. Yet I readily concede that he is a master politician, for he has an uncanny "nous" for sensing the pulse of the new Afro-Asia.

This week the news came out that Britain's new foreign secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart, had submitted to his fellow ministers at the Western European Union meeting in Rome a confidential analysis of Communist diplomatic penetration in Africa. Twenty-four hours later this produced from Nairobi this reaction from Mr. Odinga:

"During colonial days imperialist powers enjoyed the right to defend their ideological interests on Africa's soil. They still appear to retain that colonial mentality and continue to assume their activities cannot be checked."

One thing is certain to me: regardless of any private reservations President Kenyatta may feel about Mr. Odinga, when it comes to this sort of hot gospel of the new Afro-Asianism he certainly may not be checked.

VIGOROUS POLICY

But let me bring forward two authentically conservative voices to buttress my case. Mr. Bhutto is foreign minister of a regime which follows a vigorous economic policy favoring private enterprise as against the state. Yet on Afro-Asia he sounds like all the rest:

"The desire for solidarity is rooted in our general experience of colonialism and imperialism, with all the resultant indignities and exploitation. When nations emerging from foreign domination get together to promote the liberation of countries still sub-

ject to external control, it should not be regarded as merely negative unity but as a positive, moral force for human dignity and freedom."

My second authority is that other Asian conservative, Rudyard Kipling:

"Take up the White Man's burden,
and reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard."

In the Afro-Asia of 1965, the wisest rule for those heading east of Suez bearing burdens is that they should not be in uniform and not carrying guns. It is a lesson that Andrei Gromyko and Charles de Gaulle have both quite evidently learned.

COLD WAR GI BILL ESSENTIAL FOR BETTER EDUCATED AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been referred to as "education Congress," and the 89th Congress has earned itself credit for passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, this year.

However, before we can be assured of a better educated America, it is essential that we do not neglect any group of citizens who require an education in order to advance themselves in our society.

Recently, I received from Private John F. Maxwell a letter in which he states that most servicemen planning to reenter civilian life require further education if they are to compete in our society. To illustrate the need for assistance through the cold war GI bill, to these cold war veterans, I ask unanimous consent that Private Maxwell's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I have been reading about the GI bill you have introduced into the Senate. I think that such a bill would be an asset to the strength and freedom of our country.

As a soldier myself, I know some of the feelings of anxiety and worry of the return to civilian life. Upon reentering civilianhood, I, along with thousands of others, face the problems of finishing an education.

I believe that if this bill is passed, it will encourage many people to finish their educations. Most soldiers planning on regaining their civilian status understand and acknowledge the need of a good education to be better able to cope with the competition that exists in our society of free enterprise.

A program of this nature would more than repay its expenses, not only financially, but, also, in ways not measurable in money.

This bill would lead to a greater, better-educated America. An America that will not be pushed nor swayed in this unpredictable age in which we live.

I want to congratulate you on an excellent job and to encourage you to keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Pfc. JOHN F. MAXWELL.

GARDNER JACKSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a little over a week ago there died in Washington a man the like of whom America needs more—Gardner Jackson.

"Pat," as he was known affectionately by a wide circle of friends, was a crusader for fairness to the underdog, a vigilant sentry for often forlorn causes, a kindly, generous human being who spent his life in helping those of his fellow men who lacked the conventional supports which in America can often, but not always, be mobilized in behalf of the disadvantaged.

"Pat's" range of interest was wide. It included the diversity of race, creed, color, national origins, of political, social and economic discrimination. He was a liberal in the generally accepted use of that label, which perhaps always needs definition. And so, while mobilizing, as a young newspaper reporter in Boston, a campaign for a fair trial for Sacco and Vanzetti, whose electrocution for a crime which it is now generally recognized they never committed—as the late Justice Frankfurter also stoutly maintained—Gardner Jackson fought the attempted Communist penetration of the ranks of organized labor and suffered lifelong physical disabilities in consequence. Using much of his material inheritance in behalf of the victims of misfortune whom he sought to aid, he leaves to his family a priceless legacy of conspicuous courage, hopeful faith in his fellow men and of undeviating purpose to try to correct injustice.

Gardner Jackson falls into the precious category of occasional "movers and shakers" who, from the early days of our Republic, have risked contumely and obloquy to carry out the promptings of their conscience and to seek to bring American life closer to its professions and ideals. "Pat" took the inevitable obstacles that his activities aroused in his stride, good humoredly, unpretentiously and without animus. His was a great soul.

An excellent tribute to Gardner Jackson by historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. appears in the current—May 1—issue of the New Republic. I ask unanimous consent that it, an editorial from the Washington Post, and his obituary from the same paper be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Republic magazine,
May 1, 1965]

GARDNER JACKSON, 1897-1965

One of the notable figures of our times died in Washington on April 17. Gardner Jackson came from a wealthy railroad family in Colorado; but he spent his life, and most of his fortune, in helping the submerged people of his day, the subsistence farmers, the sharecroppers, the migrant laborers, the unskilled workers, the braceros, the American Indians. He began as a student by defending President Alexander Meiklejohn against conservative attacks at Amherst. As a reporter on the Boston Globe, he organized the defense committee for Sacco and Vanzetti. In New Deal Washington, he constituted a one-man farmer-labor party and reform movement, whether he happened to base himself at the Department of Agriculture or the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the CIO, or the Farmers Union. If he could get no one to work with him in combating the indignities of the world, he would cheerfully set out to do it by himself.

Because he cared so deeply about people and injustice, he forgot things other people cared about, like power, success, prestige, money. They used to say sometimes that the underdog had "Pat" Jackson on a leash; but his caring was not soft or undiscriminating. Nearly a quarter of a century ago, when I came to Washington in the first years of the war, "Pat" Jackson invited me to join a group of anti-Communist liberals in Government agencies who met regularly for dinner and discussion. His courage as labor reporter for PM in exposing communism in the unions at the height of the wartime alliance with Soviet Russia led a band of National Maritime Union thugs to set on him late one night in 1944, beating him unmercifully and blinding him in one eye. No doubt historians will be hard put to credit Gardner Jackson with specific achievements—though people in Washington, as they read about Secretary Wirtz' bracero campaign today, will remember that they first heard about Mexican migrant labor from "Pat" Jackson 30 years ago; and this is true about many other things. His was a humane and spontaneous faith, generous, and disorderly, and he quickened the lives of all who knew him. He seemed to know everybody in the America of his time—from Meiklejohn, Robert Frost, and Stark Young in his undergraduate days through Felix Frankfurter, Reed Powell, and my father in Cambridge, John Dos Passos and Edmund Wilson on Cape Cod, and Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, Henry Wallace, Francis Biddle, John L. Lewis, and James G. Patton, down to John F. Kennedy, for whom he worked in the Massachusetts senatorial campaign of 1952.

With some of these people he came to a parting of the ways. But he valued and preserved the bonds of human affection. Not being devoid of human frailties, he always distinguished between the sinner and the sin. Those whose lives he enriched never forgot him. I remember that in the White House President Kennedy used to ask me from time to time what "Pat" Jackson was up to. Next to Pat's irrepressible humanism, the cheerless bureaucratic liberalism of later years, drilled in movements and tyrannized by slogans, seemed a sad and dreary thing. Gardner Jackson's everlasting strength was his perception that people mattered more than dogma, sympathy more than righteousness—this and a rare humor and modesty about himself.

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1965]

GARDNER JACKSON

Gardner Jackson—he was Pat Jackson to everyone who knew him—represented an essentially romantic and crusading tradition in journalism and in politics. The role of detached observer was not for him. He was a part of all that he experienced, a profoundly involved mover and participant. Thus, as a young newspaperman in Boston during the 1920s, he became involved in the Sacco-Vanzetti case and took a leading role in that bitter controversy. As a reporter in Washington during the earliest days of the New Deal, he soon found himself caught up in the excitement of its reforms and directly engaged in its internal struggles. The same course characterized his relations with the turmoil in the labor movement of the 1940s.

To every cause with which he was connected, Pat Jackson gave himself unstintingly. He brought to all that he did an extraordinary exuberance and commitment, a sense of ardor and of passionate conviction. His death at 68 takes from the Washington scene a most colorful and attractive figure. If he belonged somewhat more to an exciting past than to the present, he belongs none the

In 1960 Dr. Schnittker served as a consultant to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in a study of American farm policy. In that report issued late in 1960, Dr. Schnittker worked closely with Dr. Walter Wilcox, the respected agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress, and with Dr. George Brandow, now the staff director of the National Commission on Food Marketing. This report again reaffirmed the importance of sound and responsible Government programs both to American farmers and to the national economy.

In 1960 Dr. Schnittker also published through the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station an important report on wheat programs, in which he examined the basic alternatives open to farmers and to the Congress for changes in the wheat program in the 1960's.

In October of 1960 Senator John F. Kennedy asked Dr. Schnittker to serve as chairman of a task force to examine the wheat situation and to make recommendations to him after the election. This report was made to President Kennedy after his inauguration.

In May of 1961, Dr. Schnittker joined the Department of Agriculture as staff economist and worked closely with the Secretary and his staff in the development of improved programs for the major commodities particularly feed grains and wheat.

He has appeared many times before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and other committees of the Congress and has always been most helpful to Members of Congress.

Over the last 2 years, Dr. Schnittker has also represented the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Government in connection with grain negotiations associated with the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now underway in Geneva.

Early this year, he spoke at the annual convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers in Portland, Oreg., on the critical importance of both continuation of the wheat programs in this country and developments of export markets abroad. This was an excellent statement of the crucial relationship between domestic programs and trade relationships.

As a Senator from a wheat and feed grain producing State, I welcome Dr. Schnittker's elevation, for he is a scholar, a realist, and a dedicated friend of farmers.

EDWARD R. MURROW

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the passing, yesterday, of Edward R. Murrow was a tragic loss for his family, and was an overwhelming loss for all the people of the United States. None of us will ever forget his broadcasts from England during the war. Millions of us sat by our radios regularly, waiting to hear his familiar voice saying, "This is London."

Of course, I knew him by reputation from that time; and I came to know him personally while we served together in Government. Everything I had heard was true; his integrity and his judgment earned him the highest respect of all who

knew him. President Kennedy relied implicitly on him. He made a major difference, not only in the USIA, but also in everything else he turned his hand to within the Government. His recommendations and thoughts changed the course of American foreign policy more than once. He spoke very seldom, but when he did—in Cabinet meetings, in the National Security Council, and in many of the committees of Government—he inevitably made sense, and was listened to by everyone. All of us who served with him had the greatest affection for him. For President Kennedy, he was, in a word, indispensable.

I can think of nothing more appropriate to describe Ed Murrow than the following excerpt from Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar":

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. President, the tribute to Ed Murrow, written by James Reston, and published today in the New York Times, is deeply moving and very appropriate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1965]

WASHINGTON: FAREWELL TO BROTHER ED

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Edward R. Murrow lived long enough before he died this week to achieve the two great objectives of a reporter: He endured, survived, and reported the great story of his generation, and in the process he won the respect, admiration, and affection of his profession.

The Second World War produced a great cast of characters, most of whom have been properly celebrated. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin are gone. Chiang Kai-shek is now living in the shadow of continental China, which he once commanded, and only De Gaulle of France retains power among that remarkable generation of political leaders formed in the struggle of the two World Wars.

The great generals of that time too, like MacArthur and Rommel, have died or, like Eisenhower and Montgomery, have retired; but in addition to these there was in that war a vast company of important but minor characters who played critical roles.

THE IRONY OF HISTORY

History would not have been the same without them. They were the unknown scientists, like Merle Tuve, who invented the proximity fuse and helped win the air war, and chiefs of staff like Bedell Smith, and the Foreign Service officers like Chip Bohlen and Peter Loxley of Britain, and on the side, the Boswells of the story, like Ed Murrow of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

It was odd of Ed to die this week at 57—usually his timing was much better. He was born at the right time in North Carolina—therefore he was around to understand the agony of the American South. He went west to the State of Washington as a student and therefore understood the American empire beyond the Rockies; and he came east and stumbled into radio just at the moment when it became the most powerful instrument of communication within and between the continents.

A REMARKABLE GROUP

He was part of a remarkable company of reporters from the West: Eric Sevareid, Ed

Morgan, Bill Costello, whom Murrow recruited at CBS; Hedley Donovan and Phil Potter, out of Minnesota; Elmer Davis, Ernie Pyle, Tom Stokes, Bill Shirer, Raymond Clapper, Wallace Carroll, Webb Miller, Quentin Reynolds, Wally Deuel, the Mowers, and many others, including his dearest friend, Raymond Gram Swing, who played such an important part in telling the story of the Old World's agony to America.

"THIS IS LONDON"

But Murrow was the one who was in London at that remarkable period of the battle of Britain, when all the violence and sensitivities of human life converged, and being sensitive and courageous himself, he gave the facts and conveyed the feeling and spirit of that time like nobody else.

It is really surprising that he lived to be 57. He was on the rooftops during the bombings of London, and in the bombers over the Ruhr, and on the convoys across the Atlantic from the beginning to the end of the battle. Janet Murrow, his lovely and faithful wife, and Casey, his son, never really knew where he was most of the time but somehow he survived.

In the process, he became a symbol to his colleagues and a prominent public figure in his country, and there was something else about him that increased his influence. He had style. He was handsome. He dressed with that calculated conservative casualness that marked John Kennedy. He was not a good writer, but he talked in symbols and he did so with a voice of doom.

It is no wonder that the British, who know something about the glory and tragedy of life, knighted him when they knew he was dying of cancer at the end. Their main hope in the darkest days of the German bombardment of London was that the New World would somehow understand and come to the rescue of the Old, and if anybody made the New World understand, it was Murrow.

THE RAT RACE

He hated the commercial rat race of the television networks, and fought their emphasis on what he regarded as the frivolities rather than the great issues of life, and talked constantly of escaping back into the small college atmosphere from which he came. He never made it, and probably wouldn't have liked it if he had.

Those who knew him best admired him most. He was a reporter of the old school and a performer of the new. In radio and television, only the memory of other people remains, and the memory of Ed Murrow will remain for a long time among people who remember the terrible and wonderful days of the Battle of Britain.

SUCCESSFUL RAIL COMMUTER SERVICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, during recent years it has been the fashion of many railroads to bemoan their obligations to continue passenger service, when they would rather devote their investments to the more lucrative pastime of hauling freight. Passengers, it has been repeated time and time again, cannot be transported by rail at a profit. I always believed this premise was false; and now I am glad to report that it has been proven false. Airplanes have carried passengers at a profit, and busses have carried passengers at a profit; and I believe that sincere management would enable railroads to carry passengers at a profit.

The commuter problems in Chicago and Cook County are as severe as any that will be found in the world. While

April 28, 1965

8502

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

bringing passengers to and from work in the metropolitan area, the railroads complained of revenue and operating losses year after year. New expressways were constructed to meet the public demand for effective transportation facilities. Soon, these highways were enabling hundreds of thousands of commuters to drive into Chicago every day. But this resulted in the strangulation of the city's streets and parking lots.

Recently, the Chicago and North Western Railroad began a program of attacking the railroad-commuter problem at its source; the railroad management. It brought in Ben W. Heineman as chairman, and Clyde J. Fitzpatrick as president; and these two twisted the company's thinking around to where the considerations of the commuting public became paramount, rather than continuing under the old approach of giving the public what management thought the company could afford to give.

The entire attitude of the company changed from commuter tolerance to commuter enthusiasm. The C. & N.W. proceeded to put \$50 million into new equipment designed specifically for commuter service. The bold gamble began to pay off; and in 1963, and again in 1964, the C. & N.W. operated its commuter service, using its new equipment, at a profit. This demonstrates the ability of railroads to operate this service at a profit. The story of the C. & N.W. encourages other railroads to step into this breach. Profits can be made by operating rail service for commuters; all it takes is the proper company attitude. As Mr. Heineman put it:

You can't have successful suburban service without support, interest, attention, and devotion to top management. If top management doesn't want it, it's not going to happen.

In its April 5, 1965, edition, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial on the C. & N.W.'s progress in serving the commuter; and I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 5, 1965]

WHERE THE COMMUTER IS KING: CHICAGO PRODUCES SUCCESSFUL RAPID TRANSIT WITH GOOD MANAGEMENT, THOUGH PROBLEMS LOOM

Roaring toward Chicago at high speeds from six different directions every workday morning are strings of double deck commuter cars bearing the emblems of four different railroads. They are clean, well lighted, warm in winter, cool in summer, and almost always on time. In their seats are perhaps the country's most contented railroad commuters.

There are two basic reasons why railroad commuter service is so much better in suburban Chicago. One is that most of the railroad managements there desired to make it so, and had the money or credit to implement their desires. The second is an enlightened public commission.

To four of Chicago's six major commuter railroads, the commuter is king. Together, these four have spent an aggregate \$100 million in the past 10 years for modernization

of suburban service. As a consequence they have held far more riders than the New York commuter lines. They have also cut or erased huge deficits, since newer equipment reduces their costs.

Most of these Chicago lines deal with a single State regulatory body, the Illinois Commerce Commission, which has repeatedly accepted railroad contentions that they deserve fare increases if they operate modern equipment.

Until recently Chicago has had nothing like New York's celebrated parkway system, which dates back to the 1930's, and this, too, has helped.

Now that expressway building in and around Chicago is in high gear, however, railroads are running into experiences similar to those that hit New York years ago.

The Illinois Central's daily passenger total, for example, has plummeted from 67,000 in 1957 to 46,000 today, with nearly half the decrease coming after the opening of a new expressway. For the same reason, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific lost 10 percent of its passengers in 1963. When the Kennedy Expressway opened several years ago, the Chicago & North Western, perhaps the classic case of a successful suburban operation, lost 7.3 percent of its passengers.

At the time, the North Western had actually been making a slim profit from its commuter service. But after the expressway opened, it lost a combined \$4 million in 1961 and 1962 when passengers deserted the railroad for concrete. Operations were back in the black in 1963, though, to a tune of \$706,000—for a significant reason.

Extensive highway building north of Chicago had helped bring the demise of an electric interurban railway, the Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee. But when all the former North Shore passengers were turned loose, the highways became so jammed that the North Western added customers. It now carries 72,000, up from 62,000 a decade ago.

Many in Chicago fear that as such changes occur a lack of foresight and overall planning may someday create the same problems for Chicago the New York lines now suffer from.

Even with the relative success of the Chicago railroads, there are problems that could halt the system in the future, says one top official. "Public bodies react only to crisis," he points out. "Thus," he says, "there has been no comprehensive transportation plan completed to produce an integrated system of expressways, rapid transit, and commuter lines. Unless there is this plan, in 10 or 15 years we will find Chicago's favorable transportation situation changing to unfavorable."

For the time being, however, conditions are comparatively favorable. Take the case of the North Western. It was saddled with a \$2,100,000 suburban deficit in 1957, when Chairman Ben W. Heineman and President Clyde J. Fitzpatrick spent their first year in control of the railroad. They concluded that the route to improvement lay in offering a first-class product. They first won the right to close 22 of 88 commuter stations; these were the stations closest to the city that were also being served by rapid transit lines. More importantly, they obtained a 24-percent increase in fares. Heineman then persuaded the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to lend the road what finally amounted to \$50 million to purchase new equipment.

With the new equipment came two edicts: Trains would be run on time; commuters would be pampered.

This gives another insight into the success of the C. & N.W.'s commuter service. "You can't have successful suburban service without support, interest, attention, and devotion of top management," Heineman declares. "If top management doesn't want it, it's not going to happen."

Two other moves, unusual for commuter railroads, that Heineman instituted were an advertising campaign and special classes to teach conductors how to be polite.

Since 1959, the North Western has sponsored radio helicopter traffic report programs, seeking out the people it considers its prime potential customers—motorists stalled in traffic.

WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AND SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on April 21, both the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and the respected dean of Senate Republicans, Senator AIKEN, made eloquent statements about the danger of an escalating war in southeast Asia. The applause from the galleries which greeted Senator AIKEN's remarks represented a spontaneous demonstration of the commonsense feeling of most Americans that the United States should not become involved in a major war on the Asian continent. In the April 22 issue of the New York Times, Arthur Krock had a fine article in which he praised Senators MANSFIELD, AIKEN, and FULBRIGHT for the responsible manner in which they have fulfilled their constitutional duty respecting foreign affairs.

The New York Times published a fine editorial on the same day. In its lead editorial, entitled "Desescalation" Needed," the Times commented:

Bitterness and emotionalism are increasingly entering the discussions on Vietnam in the United States. This is a deplorable development, and so is the polarization of opinion in every country and between blocs of countries. It is as if the battle lines were being drawn all over the world—but for a major war that need not and must not take place.

President Johnson launched a very tentative but real peace offensive at Johns Hopkins. He has not yet given this policy enough time but the continued bombing has tended to cast some doubt on the sincerity of the U.S. desire for negotiations.

This is clearly a moment of crisis—for Vietnam, for the United States and for the world. Less bombing, not more, offers some hope of peace—without weakness of American resolution. By taking such an attitude the United States would show strength as well as wisdom.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial and the article—both excellent—from the April 22 issue of the New York Times, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1965]

"DESCALATION" NEEDED

The war in Vietnam is to be "stepped up" Washington now says. In other words, the U.S. Government is going to continue to bomb, send in more Americans, spend more and commit more lives, money, destructiveness and power—and take more risk. In return, the hope is that Hanoi will act to curb the Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam, if it can, and will refrain from sending in more men and arms and orders to the south. The hope also is that Peking and Moscow will hold off from their own particular methods of escalation.

Those who have all along feared that the course the war has been taking since early February would force the United States into an ever greater commitment, leading to ever greater danger to Asia and to the world, are unhappily being proved true prophets. Once a war begins, forces take over which seem beyond control. In Vietnam, on both sides, one step is leading—as if inexorably—to another and then another. Continuation of the present process by the opposing forces could lead to catastrophe.

Nothing is more important for Americans today than to face these hard truths before it is too late. And it is vital that the channels of communication, of opinion and of dissent be kept open—on the floor of Congress, in the press, in the country at large—in the face of a growing tendency to ridicule or to denounce the opposition and to demand unswerving support of further escalation in the name of patriotism.

Bitterness and emotionalism are increasingly entering the discussions on Vietnam in the United States. This is a deplorable development, and so is the polarization of opinion in every country and between blocs of countries. It is as if the battlelines were being drawn all over the world—but for a major war that need not and must not take place.

President Johnson's offer of "unconditional discussions" was a splendid move on the diplomatic/political front, in the effort to achieve a peaceful solution of the quarrel. While it deserved a far better response from the other side than it has yet received, it did mark, as we have previously noted, a beginning to an interchange among the combatants—subtle and indirect, but nevertheless a beginning.

But the continued bombing of North Vietnam makes progress toward a peaceful settlement—however far off it must necessarily be—more difficult rather than less, harder rather than easier. We think that as a followup to the President's fine declaration in Baltimore, a descalation of the war is needed, rather than the escalation that we now see imminent.

It is at least worth the effort to see whether a scaling-down of the bombing might not evoke a corresponding scaling-down of North Vietnamese aggression in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese incidents in the South are easily measurable; if a diminution of American bombing of the North should lead to a diminution in the rate of incidents in the South, a major step would thereby be signaled toward the "unconditional discussions" offered by the President.

Of course there might be no such response at all; and if there were not, the bombing would be resumed. But at least a descalation such as we suggest would afford the opportunity to the other side of making a gesture toward peace without losing face. It might lead, ultimately, to a cease-fire and a truce.

President Johnson launched a very tentative but real peace offensive at Johns Hopkins. He has not yet given this policy enough time but the continued bombing has tended to cast some doubt on the sincerity of the U.S. desire for negotiations.

This is clearly a moment of crisis—for Vietnam, for the United States and for the world. Less bombing, not more, offers some hope for peace—without any weakness of American resolution. By taking such an attitude the United States would show strength as well as wisdom.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1965]

IN THE NATION: THE SENATE ON VIETNAM
(By Arthur Krook)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—On the initiative of its majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate today responsibly fulfilled the role assigned to it by the Constitution to advise the President on foreign affairs.

Senator FULBRIGHT who, in his official capacity as chairman of the committee on which the Senate relies for guidance on these questions, has been subjected to unwarranted abuse for stating as a mere hypothesis that "the prospects for discussions" looking to peace in southeast Asia "might be enhanced by a temporary cessation" by the United States of the military actions it is steadily escalating in the Vietnam. But, except for specific endorsement of what FULBRIGHT plainly identified as only a speculation, all the Senate speeches today were directed at the same objective, which MANSFIELD expressed as follows:

APPLYING GENEVA PRINCIPLE

It is of the utmost importance that the question of how to apply the principle of the Geneva agreement of 1954 be faced as soon as possible. * * * The longer this confrontation is put off, the more the people of North and South Vietnam pay for the delay, and the more the likelihood that the present limited conflict will spread into a general war in Asia.

His reference was to a proposal that the Geneva Conference be reconvened on the limited basis of producing an international guarantee of the neutrality of Vietnam's neighbor, Cambodia. "The need for a confrontation," he said, "on [this] situation in which none [the United States, Communist China, and the two Vietnams] is involved so directly may indeed be a preliminary to a separate and second confrontation on Vietnam in which the involvement of all is direct." And though MANSFIELD extolled the President as one who has "grasped the problem fully," citing his call for "unconditional discussions with the object of restoring a decent and honorable peace," it was evident from remarks by Senators who praised MANSFIELD's observations that they detected in these their own doubts of the wisdom of escalating U.S. military attacks on North Vietnam while there is the slightest possibility of progress in the secret negotiations for reconvening a Geneva Conference on Cambodia.

"While the talk goes on," said MANSFIELD, "the bloodshed also goes on. And the bleeding is not being done in the capitals of the world. It is being done in the ricefields and the jungles of Vietnam" whose peasants, in all probability, want peace and a minimum of contact with distant Saigon and distant Hanoi—not to speak of places of which they have scarcely heard about—Peiping, Moscow, or Washington. This called attention to the officially inconvenient fact that the conflict is in part a civil war.

CONFLICTING VIEWS

Taking this from the majority leader as his cue, Senator AIKEN protested that "it is difficult to see—except as an act of braggadocio—what U.S. military leaders are trying to accomplish when they send 200 planes to destroy one little bridge." But on the same day that the Senate was voicing its disturbance over the policy of military escalation, Secretary of Defense McNamara was announcing its wide expansion, as agreed on at the Honolulu conference this week. This conflict of attitudes is the inevitable product of the involvement into which the U.S. Government has drifted in Vietnam.

The Senate today reflected its alarmed conviction that the time is overdue for ending the war in southeast Asia, hopefully through the back door of guaranteed neutrality of Cambodia. But it has no magic formula for reconvening a Geneva Conference, now that the U.S.S.R. which proposed this has set preconditions it is aware the United States cannot possibly accept. And the close Presidential relations of some of the sources of the hysterical attacks on Senator FULBRIGHT for speculating that a temporary halt of U.S. military actions against North Vietnam

"might" be the best way to discover whether the aggressors are open to a reasonable and honorable settlement, suggest that this idea has no future in the administration.

TO RESTORE PEACE

President Johnson has more information than the Senate can possibly have for the alarm which MANSFIELD and others expressed on the floor. But the sole meaning to be read into Secretary McNamara's announcement on the same day is that continued escalation of the Vietnam war on a steadily rising scale is our only policy for the restoration of peace in southeast Asia.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON IS THE BEST JUDGE OF WHEN STATE VISITS SHOULD OCCUR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, our Government's postponement of the state visits to this country by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan has been unfairly criticized in this country and abroad. Frankly, I have been amazed at the lack of perspective on the part of those who have instigated this criticism. The President of the United States has a tremendous burden of responsibilities at all times; and at this particular time the international situation has made this burden greater than any man should have to bear. The President, moreover, is carrying out these responsibilities very well, with wisdom and courage.

This ridiculous tempest over the obviously necessary postponement of the state visits during this trying period is wholly unjustified.

Mr. President, with a personal apology for its choice of adjectives, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 22. I strongly agree with its wish that our homegrown and overseas advisers—who do not have any of the President's burdens—would give more weight to how he does his job, and less to relatively minor points of etiquette.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 22, 1965]

L.B.J. DOESN'T CLAIM TO BE COUTH

Some Nervous Nellie editorial writers and commentators, who think more of protocol than substance, are aflutter over President Johnson's request to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan to postpone their visits to the United States.

A social—or a state—visit should be arranged at the convenience of both the guest and the host.

If a host, at a given time, has family problems, naturally he would prefer that a guest come later when the family crisis has passed, especially if the guest is someone who has a penchant for advising the host on how to handle family problems.

It so happens that our President and our Congress are in the throes of decisions on foreign aid, in which India and Pakistan are involved to the tune of around a billion dollars. It also happens that we are involved in unpleasant difficulties in Vietnam, concerning which the Indians and Pakistanis have differing ideas on how we should meet our responsibilities. We seem to be getting advice from lots of folks who do not share our responsibilities.

It is one thing for them to advise from their own far-off rostrums, and quite another for them to come inside our borders to launch their views. That might really have muddled congressional waters where foreign aid allotments are supposed to be made on merit rather than emotional reaction.

We wish some of our homegrown and oversea advisers on our President's manners would give a bit more weight to how he does his job, and less to his etiquette.

The gentleman from the Federnales River will never balance a teacup on his knee to their satisfaction—but when not nibbled to distraction by their mincing criticism, he has demonstrated he is quite a hand at getting results.

THE SECURITY TITLE GROUP AND E. CLAYTON GENGRAS

MR. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Hartford, Conn., has long been known as the insurance capital of the Nation. The insurance industry has benefited for years from the great leadership of E. Clayton Gengras, board chairman of the Security Insurance Group.

The Security Insurance Group has just completed its move to Hartford, Conn. Thus, the Security Group becomes the 26th insurance home office in the Greater Hartford area, and the 34th in the State of Connecticut.

The Security Title Group is a consolidated group of five property and casualty companies and one life insurance company: Security Connecticut Life Insurance Co., Security Insurance Co. of Hartford, New Amsterdam Casualty Co., United States Casualty Co., the Connecticut Indemnity Co., and the Fire and Casualty Insurance Co. of Connecticut.

The group has over 1 million policyholders, and operates in all 50 States, with 30 branch offices in principal cities throughout the country.

The group has 650 employees in its home office, 1,100 employees in its branch offices, and 6,000 agents throughout the country.

The Hartford Times recently published an excellent biography of Mr. Gengras and his dynamic operation. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Apr. 19, 1965]
MOVER AND SHAKER IN INSURANCE—THE GENGRAS IMPACT

E. Clayton Gengras, noted for his verve and drive in the business world, not only plays out this role, he also looks the part.

This brown-eyed 56-year-old West Hartford native is trim and agile and is well-known among colleagues and executives as a man who uses little waste motion—he moves quickly, doesn't like long conferences, makes fast, on-the-spot decisions, hates organizational "deadwood."

These qualities have put him to good stead in many business ventures, and his movement into the insurance industry is no exception. The Gengras "touch" has marked him as one of the few men who has ventured to demonstrate that the same principles can be applied to an intangible product—insurance—as to a tangible one.

SALES ORIENTED

Mr. Gengras and the executives around him are sales-oriented since this son of a

West Hartford dentist, starting on the ground floor in the automobile business with a job in a garage in the midtwenties, early gained success as a salesman, first of the celebrated Stutz, and then, in 1931, of Fords.

In 1937, he opened a Ford agency in West Hartford, and married Elizabeth Hutchins. His business grew almost as quickly as did his family, eventually adding Ford dealerships in Hartford, Providence, R.I., and Queens, and the Lincoln distributorship for all of Connecticut except Fairfield County.

During World War II, he held his business together in large part by selling to priority-rated customers cars from the large inventory he had when civilian production ended.

WAR YEARS

In 1942, Mr. Gengras bought the Dauntless Shipyard in Essex, Conn., where 350 Coast Guard training ships were built. He then founded the Clayton Manufacturing Co., which, under Government contract, did oversea crating and packing and built gliders. In 1945, he sold the shipyard, dissolved Clayton Manufacturing and went back to automobiles.

It was not until 1950 that he entered the insurance field. Two years earlier, he had established Connecticut Acceptance, Inc., an auto financing company. Wanting to insure his financing deals, too, he bought the Fire & Casualty Insurance Co., of Connecticut.

Mr. Gengras took his second step into the insurance field in 1953, when a patient of his father's approached him with an offer of 50,000 shares, at \$60 each, of the National Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford.

NATIONAL

Though he did not buy the offered stock, Mr. Gengras became a National Fire director and finance committee member. He later became a major stockholder. In 1956, the company was merged with the Continental Casualty Co. of Chicago.

He bought 35 percent of the Security Group's stock in 1957. The group was then made up of the Security Insurance Co. of New Haven, the Connecticut Indemnity Co. and the Security-Connecticut Life Insurance Co.

The next year Security bought Mr. Gengras' Fire & Casualty Co. In 1960, Security acquired the Founders Insurance Co. of Los Angeles in an exchange of stock.

The next year, the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. of Baltimore and its wholly owned subsidiary, the United States Casualty Co. of New York became the sixth and seventh members, but not without a fight with a major underwriter, the Home Insurance Co.

NEW AMSTERDAM

New Amsterdam's staff was reduced from 2,400 to 1,400 employees, and operations were centralized in the Baltimore office. Its New York buildings were sold, through their manager, to the Home. Similarly, Mr. Gengras had reduced by half the Security Group's New Haven staff of 800.

After several years in New Haven and Baltimore upgrading and reorganizing operations came what has been a milestone for Mr. Gengras, the climactic move to Hartford.

As he said in an announcement of the move last May before top business leaders at the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, "It's nice to be back home."

This Hartford area native has overcome initial scorn by aggressive renovations in the insurance industry. Among his techniques: Expansion through acquisition of established companies and cost-cutting centralization of operations.

Stressing of incentive payments (rather than high initial commissions) for agents, resulting in higher sales.

Highly selective risk coverages (for better underwriting profits), and quick settlement of claims.

JOSEPH KRAFT ON VIETNAM

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President, during the current Vietnam crisis, the articles written by Joseph Kraft have been among the best which have appeared. His article entitled "General War Held a Real Threat" was particularly outstanding. Mr. Kraft maintains that the time to try to achieve a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is now, before the major Communist powers are drawn into Southeast Asia. Mr. Kraft aptly concludes his article in this way:

Once the Chinese enter North Vietnam in large numbers, the prospects for settlement go down to zero.

What has happened, in sum, is that the Russians and Chinese, once holding back, are now competing to help Hanoi. In these circumstances, the deeper the Americans become engaged, the deeper the Russians and Chinese will become engaged. Instead of a merely hypothetical possibility, the spread of the limited conflict in Vietnam to a more general war has become a real threat.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was published in the April 23 issue of the Washington Evening Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WAR HELD A REAL THREAT

(By Joseph Kraft)

Washington is now approaching a point of no return in Vietnam. Diverse, though vague, possibilities for negotiations exist. But the logic of the war effort—the supposed military necessity—is pushing this country toward measures that would certainly compromise immediate prospects for settlement, and possibly plunge the United States into an endless war on the Asian mainland.

The hopes for settlement arise from two principal documents—the President's April 7 speech in Baltimore—and the four-point resolution of the North Vietnamese Assembly on April 10. The statements come from the highest, most responsible authority in each county. Both were measured and careful in tone. At least in words, they expressed a surprising amount of agreement.

Both countries are agreed that there need be no preconditions before discussion can get underway. Both call for a return to the Geneva Treaty of 1954. Both imply free choice for South Vietnam in picking its own regime and on the matter of unification with the north. Both look toward the eventual withdrawal of American troops.

To be sure, there are two important points of disagreement. One involves the rebels in the south, the so-called Vietcong. Washington has tended to exclude them from any approach to the conference table; Hanoi insists on their participation.

But that is a juridical issue, open to many different formulas of compromise, and thus one that could usefully be discussed. For that purpose, an immediate occasion is at hand. It lies in the proposal by Britain and the Soviet Union, as cochairman of the Geneva powers, to convoke the signatories in order to consider a complaint from Cambodia respecting alleged violations of her territory. If the soundings now in progress on such a conference proved satisfactory, it could begin in a matter of days. Even if the soundings did not prove out, it would not be difficult to find other occasions for talks—either secretly or in public.

The other big sticking point is a cease-fire. Neither side has yet declared itself officially on that issue. But once again there are some opportunities. Vietcong attacks have fallen in the last few weeks from a high of 35 in the week of March 6 to 18 to a low of

vious condition of servitude. There was no provision which would touch the right of Congress to fix qualifications.

This bill is as unconstitutional as it can be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, can the Senator think of anything that would be more unconstitutional than this bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We might provide for the immediate repeal of the 10th amendment. This bill would practically do that.

Mr. HILL. That amendment ratified, affirmed, and confirmed the very thing the Senator said; namely, that the power to fix qualifications was to be absolutely and wholly within the power and authority of the States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. George Mason, Patrick Henry, and others claimed that Congress would eventually override the States and that the States would lose their power.

Virginia would not have ratified the Constitution but for the promise of George Washington, James Madison, and the great jurist John Marshall, that amendments would be offered. They spelled out 12 of the amendments.

One of the amendments was the 10th amendment, which provided that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government or denied to the States, would be reserved to the States and the people.

Virginia was the largest State in area and population. Virginia was the most powerful and richest State. When the State of Virginia entered the Union, it had more Members in the House than any other State. The largest city south of Philadelphia was Williamsburg. Think of that.

We would not have had any perfect Union without the 10th amendment. What kind of Union would we have if we were to pass this bill and take part of the 10th amendment out of the Constitution? That is what it would boil down to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I congratulate my distinguished colleague for the very fine speech he made today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INCREDIBLE VIEWS OF FORMER SENATOR GOLDWATER ON WAR WITH CHINA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I was appalled by the report in today's Washington Post of statements made by former Senator Barry Goldwater in Paris on yesterday. According to the distinguished Washington Post foreign correspondent, Waverly Root, Mr. Goldwater told newsmen at the Anglo-American Press Association luncheon that he "prays for Red China to provide provocations which would justify the United States in attacking her atomic installations, but he doesn't think she will."

As reported by Mr. Root, "the statement on China came in answer to the question of a British reporter who asked whether Goldwater would advocate attacking Chinese military, industrial, or atomic installation: 'Yes, if they give

us provocation,' Goldwater answered. 'No, if they do not give us provocation. I rather pray that Red China would give us provocation to attack her military and atomic installations.'

Asked what would constitute sufficient provocation for attacking China, Goldwater said "If China sends troops into South Vietnam or materiel in massive quantities."

In other words, Mr. President, what Mr. Goldwater is saying is that he hopes China will send troops into the Vietnamese conflict so that we will have an excuse to launch an attack on China.

Mr. President, this is the most incredible statement I have ever attributed to a prominent national figure. We can only speculate on the disastrous course our nation might have followed had Goldwater been elected to the Presidency last fall. Consider the impact on the rest of the world if a leading American figure openly praying that China will intervene in the Vietnamese war so that we will have an excuse to launch world war III by attacking this largest of all nations on the face of the earth. That concept is almost beyond comprehension. It makes one shudder at the mere expression of the thought, particularly when it was expressed in a foreign country at the largest luncheon ever held by the Anglo-American Press Association.

We can be thankful that the American people in their wisdom elected to the Presidency Lyndon Johnson, who has not only given repeated assurances that he seeks no wider war in Vietnam, but has offered to proceed at anytime with unconditional negotiations.

I applaud the President's appointment of the distinguished W. Averell Harriman to represent us at the proposed conference on Cambodian neutrality. That conference, as our majority leader has repeatedly reminded us, can open the door to further discussions leading to a settlement on the Vietnamese war.

As I first indicated on April 1, I trust that the President will also interrupt the bombing of North Vietnam long enough to provide some breathing room for the regime in Hanoi to consider negotiations, because, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said, it is very difficult to create a climate favorable to negotiations so long as attacks continue on both sides. I would like to believe that this Nation is big enough and great enough to break the cycle of blows and counterblows which is a formula for a larger and larger war.

I also hope that our great President would not hesitate to consider some arrangement under which the National Liberation Front fighting in South Vietnam can be represented at negotiating sessions. After all, the principal antagonists in Vietnam are the South Vietnamese Government in Saigon and the South Vietnamese Liberation Front, which speaks for the Vietcong guerrillas. Unless those two principal antagonists can work out some kind of a settlement, it seems to me we miss the main point.

Negotiations must take place so that these two groups can reach some kind of a settlement, if the fighting is to cease. We should not lose sight of the fact that

however much Hanoi and Peiping encourage and support the Vietcong guerrillas, this has always been fundamentally an internal struggle involving the Government of South Vietnam on one hand, and the Vietnamese guerrilla forces on the other.

I further hope that if negotiations do go forward, we will consider the creation of a southeast Asian peacekeeping force composed primarily of forces supplied by Burma, Cambodia, Thailand, Laos, Malaya, and Vietnam, and other nations in the southeast Asia area. I think it has been one of the ingredients missing from the agreement of 1954. We have had no effective peacekeeping force to bring into that area under the agreements at Geneva 11 years ago.

Such a regional force affiliated with the United Nations would be in a much stronger position to stabilize this area of conflict and tension than would a unilateral force of Americans operating 8,000 miles away from home in alien territory.

Mr. President, one of the tragic aspects of this war is the growing terrorism on both sides.

I suspect that one of the prices we pay for an undeclared war is that it stays outside the scope of the application of international law that is applied in international conflicts.

Americans have certainly felt a growing sense of uneasiness about the use of our weapons to burn villages, destroy the jungle foliage, and wreak havoc on the Vietnamese countryside. All of this, however, has been accompanied by mounting terrorist activity by the Vietcong guerrillas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of 12 recent acts of terrorism on the part of the Vietcong guerrillas directed primarily at U.S. personnel.

I request further that the article by Waverly Root reporting on Mr. Goldwater's comments printed in this morning's Washington Post be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list and news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCIDENTS OF TERRORISM DIRECTED PRIMARILY AT U.S. PERSONNEL

1. On June 28, 1963, a bicycle bomb exploded near the wall of the MAAG compound in Saigon. A second similar incident followed by 10 minutes. Five U.S. personnel were injured.

2. On February 9, 1964, following a series of minor incidents, two bombs exploded under the bleachers of Pershing Field in Saigon. There were 2 U.S. personnel killed and 23 were injured.

3. A week later, on February 16, 1964, the U.S. movie theater in Saigon was attacked. The theater was heavily damaged. Three Americans were killed and 35 injured.

4. On August 12, 1964, a plastic bomb exploded on a bicycle at My Tho. Five Americans were wounded and three killed.

5. On August 25, 1964, the Caravelle Hotel in Saigon was bombed. There was extensive damage to the fifth floor but only one American was wounded.

6. On November 1, 1964, mortar fire delivered on the Bien Hoa Airfield killed 4 Americans and injured 72, while destroying many airplanes.

April 28, 1965

7. On Christmas Eve of 1964 the Brink Hotel in Saigon was bombed, killing 2 Americans and wounding 64 others. There was extensive damage and the hotel is now unoccupied.

8. On January 26, 1965, two time bombs exploded in MACV's secondary headquarters in Saigon but injured only one American.

9. On February 7, 1965, the Vietcong attacked the Pleiku compound killing 9 Americans and wounding 107.

10. On February 10, 1965, the Vietcong attacked the Qui Nhon U.S. enlisted men's billet. Twenty-three Americans were killed, 21 injured, and 7 Vietnamese were killed. The 4-story billet was destroyed.

11. On March 30, 1965, the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was bombed. Two Americans were killed and 48 wounded. Fourteen Vietnamese were killed and 106 wounded.

12. The most recent serious incident occurred on April 14, 1965, at Qui Nhon when an explosion was set off in U.S. ammunition storage. Thirty-one Americans were wounded in action, 13 of them by small arms fire which followed the explosion.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

BARRY SEES PEPPING FEAR OF ATTACK
(By Waverly Root, Washington Post foreign service)

PARIS, April 27.—Former Senator Barry Goldwater told 135 persons at the largest luncheon the Anglo-American Press Association has ever held today that he prays for Red China to provide provocations which would justify the United States attacking her atomic installations—but he doesn't think she will.

He also said he backed President Johnson's policy in Vietnam, that he did not expect nuclear weapons to be used there, and that while he doesn't expect to make another try for the presidency, he might run again for the Senate. But he said he found it rather pleasant to "stay home, play with my grandchildren, hunt and fish, humming 'Hail To The Chief!'"

The statement on China came in answer to the question of a British reporter who asked whether Goldwater would advocate attacking Chinese military, industrial, or atomic installations.

"Yes, if they give us provocation," Goldwater answered. "No, if they do not give us provocation. I rather pray that Red China would give us provocation to attack her military and atomic installations."

He added that "many peoples around the world would be happy to see China's nuclear capacity disappear."

RUSSIANS INCLUDED

He confirmed after his public speech that when he spoke of many peoples, he had Russians in mind among others.

Asked what would constitute sufficient provocation for attacking China, Goldwater said, "if China sends troops into South Vietnam or matériel in massive quantities."

He said this would not necessarily mean war. He said the United States could punish China from air or sea, where her strength is superior, but he would never favor sending ground troops in. "No country," he said, "can match China on the ground."

But he expressed the opinion that China will not provide provocation as he had defined it.

Asked by another British newspaperman how long the United States can keep China out of the United Nations, Goldwater said, "if it comes right down to it, I don't think we could keep her out very long."

He admitted the strength of the argument that a nation of 600 or 700 million is hard to ignore, but went on, "in the United States, this is a political question. If you want to get into trouble there, just advocate admitting Red China to the United Nations, or recognizing her."

"Do you agree with President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam?" Goldwater was asked.

JOHNSON SUPPORTED

"I have to say yes. My President has done the right thing, in the right way."

This came after Goldwater had introduced himself by saying, "If you don't know who I am, I'm the trigger-happy war-mongering * * * who proposed bombing the supply routes from North Vietnam. You're a statesman today when you propose that. I was a year too early."

Goldwater and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko were both on the town last night, playing an unperceived game of hide-and-seek, but so far as anyone knows their criss-crossing paths never intersected.

That was because they were pursuing widely different interests, both artistic. Gromyko was looking at the architectural gems of Paris and Goldwater was being tattooed.

LAST TATTOO

This took Gromyko to such magnificent sights of Paris as Notre Dame Cathedral and the Place de la Concorde, with fountain playing full blast, both floodlighted.

It took Goldwater to a narrow street climbing up the Montmartre hill behind the Pigalle Quarter. This is where you have to go to find one of the world's most famous tattoo artists, known by the single name of Bruno, whose weird working hours are 5 p.m. to 2 a.m.

Goldwater went there to have a Hopi Indian insignia near the base of his thumb completed. Member of a white man's association interested in Hopi folklore, Goldwater already had the first insignia—two little points symbolizing a snake bite. He also had the two dots, one below the other, beneath the bite mark, each of which signifies participation in a dance. After that you can dance and dance, but you earn no more dots. However, Goldwater was notified while here that he had just been named an honorary chief, which gives him the right to a half circle over the snake bite. He had it added last night.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I was not present in the Chamber and did not hear the early part of the Senator's statement. Did the Senator quote from what Secretary McNamara said or what former Senator Goldwater said?

Mr. McGOVERN. The quotation was from an article appearing in today's Washington Post, under the byline of Waverly Root, and is attributed to former Senator Goldwater.

Mr. MORTON. I thought that perhaps it might have been Secretary McNamara.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th

amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, those of us who are proponents of the bill have found, in recent days, so much concentration of attention on the issue of the poll tax which, interestingly enough, is eliminated by bills pending in both this and the other body, that we thought it might be useful to discuss the matter again, to make our position clear on the RECORD, and to underline the fact that elimination of the poll tax would represent a really tangible and practical element of progress in the field of civil rights.

It is interesting to me that we have acted cautiously with respect to this problem in the past by adopting a constitutional amendment which eliminates it only as to Federal elections, but that we now find this half measure does not really cure the situation. For all practical purposes, the voter is still called upon to pay the poll tax.

I believe that it is fair to call the poll tax an anachronism. It is difficult to see how it can be defended by anyone except on the basis that the States should be permitted to do whatever they please in terms of defining as a qualification something which is not a qualification, or in terms of clinging to every vestigial institution, whatever it may be, including the poll tax, which places restrictions upon the voting right.

As a constitutional lawyer, it is my judgment—and I put into practice what I teach in theory, by introducing legislation to eliminate the poll tax by statute on previous occasions—that the poll tax can be eliminated by statute. This is central, I believe, to the theme of the majority on the Judiciary Committee which supported the amendment, that the poll tax in fact represents a burden on the voting right and an abridgment of the voting right within the context of the 15th amendment, and that as it has worked out it represents discrimination in favor of those who are economically able to pay and against those who are economically unable to pay.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has actually been used as an instrument to perpetuate abridgement of the right to register and vote, and therefore, both on the basis of law and practice—and the Supreme Court has always considered both—the poll tax should be abolished.

To those who would cite Breedlove against Suttles, which is the Georgia case which upheld a poll tax levied by a State, I would say two things: First, that case can be easily distinguished on the facts from the case now pending before the Supreme Court, Harper against the Virginia State Board of Elections, which will be argued this fall and undoubtedly decided reasonably soon thereafter. Second, the question of the 15th amendment was not even raised in Breedlove against Suttles.

Most of the States have repealed the poll tax. Only four States still have it.

The decisions by the Supreme Court in civil rights cases clearly indicate that

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

polls, research reports, factfinding, one-man and any-man opinions, searching looks which were meant to penetrate and describe what has been called, from time to time, "the agony of the GOP," "a party in crisis," "the GOP struggle for survival," "dialectic Republicanism," "the Republican election trauma," "can the elephant forget?" and the "Republicans after the debacle," with each report usually coming to the brilliant conclusion that the Republican Party was in a bit of a mess.

As a Republican, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who contributed in such a thoughtful and well meaning way to starting us off on the long road back and if they have run out of salt for our wounds, I would be glad to replenish their supply.

I am not trying to minimize the extent of rethinking and the tough policy and leadership decisions that will be necessary for the GOP to win elections again. It's not every year that a party loses over 500 seats in State legislatures across the Nation, along with key Senate and House seats.

But I do not foresee the 1964 Goldwater candidacy as the Republican's albatross, relegating the party to minority status for years to come. Neither do I believe it represented a strictly indigenous attitude of the Republican Party.

The American concept of conservatism is not confined to one political party. The particular attitude which dominated the 1964 Republican Convention has lain under the surface of American political activity for 20 years, since the inception of the cold war.

It has been the reservoir of frustration resulting from our necessary international role, and the repository of fear, mistrust, and insecurity which are products of the social and economic adjustments since the war.

If the election was supposed to offer a choice, it was 20 years too late, and if we wanted the candidates to embody that choice, the American public missed its chance in 1952 when it failed to match Adlai Stevenson and Robert A. Taft, two articulate representatives of opposing philosophies.

The possibility of a liberal-conservative confrontation passed from the sublime to the ridiculous and 1964 witnessed a campaign billed as a great confrontation of America's past with its future, between two men who were probably personally in more general agreement on more issues than any two opposing candidates in recent history.

Frankly, I am less concerned about the supposed "cost" of this election to the Republican Party than I am about its cost to the American people.

It deprived us of the necessary and serious exchange of views on the alternative ways of dealing with the difficult problems this country faces, both at home and abroad; of exploring the meaning and extent of our involvement in South Vietnam; of debating and examining the proposed programs to eradicate poverty, to provide medical care for the aged, aid to public, private, and parochial school education and the myriad other problems that majorities of both parties recognize and are committed to resolve.

In short, the American people were deprived of the opportunity to judge a campaign that bore some relation to the real world and its very real problems.

Instead, we watched TV spots with people tearing up their social security cards; the projected image of a choice between good and evil, black and white, war and peace—not that it wasn't ripe for presentation along those lines and the obvious image for the party in power to exploit, but what was the result after the Nation went through the motions of registering their choice. What was the result after the computers predicted the winner within one-tenth of 1 percent accuracy 10 minutes after the polls closed? What had happened, or rather what had not happened?

The administration, the incumbent, had not been put to a test; he had not been challenged; he did not have to defend the policies and programs he had set before the Nation and was proposing for the future. What did he have to defend them against? His program for aid to education against no program? His background as a leader in civil rights against that of his opponent?

We did not learn very much about the way the President would react under the pressure of an articulate and well-directed opposition to whom the public was listening and to whom he would be expected to reply.

Discussion of the whole area of foreign policy took place under a mushroom cloud which prevented the public from giving serious consideration to what else the President must do besides refrain from "pushing the button."

We are facing some of the consequences of the lack of public debate in this area right now. The public was ill informed and unprepared for our present policy in Vietnam and the temper of the man who is directing it. The campaign was supposed to have been between a dove and a hawk. The dove won. So, what's he doing acting like a hawk?

The campaign distorted the issues and the candidates, and in the end, not only did Goldwater lose, but Johnson lost and the American people lost. Why? Because the presidential process failed to work. It failed to force a presidential candidate to win the Presidency. It was left to him by default and we didn't accurately judge the man who won.

Our fling for the sake of the American political neurosis cost us more than the election and I am more distressed by that than anything else.

In terms of practical politics, the Republican Party need not ask of Goldwater and the ensuing election disaster, in the words of an old popular song, "Is you is, or is you ain't my baby?" It's our baby, all right, although many of us question the parentage.

At least there is one thing upon which all Republicans can agree, and that is that the party's major task between now and the 1966 congressional elections is to project a positive Republican image in keeping with the true traditions of the party.

In 18 months the Republican Party will again face the electorate, and we must face the electorate with a constructive record of accomplishment.

I suggest with pride that the Republican congressional delegation has distinguished itself in the two critical areas of foreign and domestic policy with honor and good judgment.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representatives FORD and McCULLOCH have played and are playing an admirable role in the effort to write an effective and problem-solving voting rights bill.

Almost without exception, the Republican congressional delegation has given loyal and valuable assistance to the President in regard to the crisis in Vietnam.

In the matter of foreign policy our responsibility as Republicans, as the loyal opposition, is a particularly important one and a particularly delicate one.

The Republican Party has a special obligation in the Vietnam crisis and in all other foreign policy crises to insist that the minority voice, the voice which challenges administration policy is heard.

If there is anything that is more troubling than the problem of Vietnam itself, and the role of the United States in Vietnam, it is the increasingly hysterical and thoughtless tone which has characterized public discussion about Vietnam.

I think, in such a crisis, that the minority party, the Republican Party must be the un-deviating ally of the press as you and your colleagues seek to supply the Nation with the facts about Vietnam.

It is no reflection on the good faith, the

good intentions, or the ability of those charged with the execution of U.S. policy in Vietnam to remind them and the Nation that the public and the minority party also have a vital role to play in this crisis.

All need to know the plain truth about what is happening in Vietnam. We need to know the good news and the bad news. We need to know our strengths and our weaknesses.

When overzealous, oversensitive men—civilian or military—attempt to impose a news blackout from Vietnam, try to conceal what is happening there and elsewhere in southeast Asia, I submit that the Republican Party has the responsibility to speak out loudly and clearly in favor of your right to gather the facts and the public's right to know them.

A party that controls neither the White House nor the Congress is in a difficult position to take the lead in offering new ideas and programs to deal with such problems as health, housing, education, transportation; the increasingly important and complex problems of our growing urban centers.

A party's programs and goals in these areas are formulated at its convention and hammered into its platform.

Unfortunately the Republican Party's 1964 platform committed and its product did not impress upon the American public the commitment and resolve of the party as a whole; to devise thoughtful and effective programs to meet the needs in these areas.

This lack of a realistic and meaningful action program for the party is the major obstacle to our presenting the Republican Party to the American people in 1966 as a serious alternative to those presently in power.

When I was asked by reporters on election night, what I thought might be done to begin to overcome the disastrous defeat we had suffered, I suggested then, and still believe, that it was important to hold a national Republican convention or conference, in this off year, to formulate a sound Republican position on the host of foreign and domestic problems which confront the Nation.

There is precedent for such an off year conference in both the Democratic and Republican Party.

I am of the opinion that a conference of this nature would go a long way toward crystallizing both leadership and policy within the party, giving new direction and vigor to our coming election efforts.

It has been asked, "what good is a political party unless it is serving some great national purpose?"

Out of power the Republican Party must be an articulate and informed opposition and when we assume national leadership the party must pursue our goals at home and abroad with programs that show a deep concern for the individual. If the Democrats call themselves the party of the people, then we are the party of the individual, concerned with the place and dignity of man; his rights and his welfare, his future in a free society. A party demonstrating this concern will deserve the support of the American people. A party demonstrating this concern will win the support of the American people.

The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 annual report of the Shipbuilders

April 28, 1965

Council of America carries a most interesting and revealing article entitled "The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower."

I recommend a close analysis of this succinct article to each of my colleagues for I feel we have been lax in recognizing the significance of Russia's advances:

THE GROWING THREAT OF SOVIET SEAPOWER

Also included in last year's report was an official assessment of the condition of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet prepared by the Deputy Chief of Naval Operation (Logistics). This showed that our merchant fleet is in even more critical shape than the naval fleet. Over 90 percent of the dry-cargo ships and 55 percent of the tankers in the fleet will shortly reach the end of their economic lives simultaneously. There has been no improvement in this situation.

In addition, the active fleet, which numbered 1,950 ships totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons in 1951, has contracted steadily and now is composed of only 900 ships aggregating 13 million tons.

Any significant improvement of the future outlook for the private shipyards must await official recognition of the deteriorated state of this Nation's seapower resources. This day of reckoning cannot be delayed or postponed much longer. Time is running out.

Budgetary expeditives adopted for too many previous years account for the alarming block obsolescence problems which now afflict our naval and merchant fleets. Our shortsighted policies also have taken their toll on the private shipyard industry, as evidenced by the fact that 18 private shipyards have been forced to close their gates permanently during the past 10 years.

Of necessity, our national planners ultimately will have to face up to the block obsolescence or this Nation will lose its sea power capability by default. We believe the former alternative will prevail. Hopefully, the required remedial action will be taken before further contraction in the size of the private shipyard industry occurs.

The sharp contrast in the priorities which Russia and the United States have assigned to seapower again was all too evident during 1964.

Russia's naval strength continued to grow and her enormous merchant fleet expansion program was further accelerated. In this country a welcome increase in naval ship construction occurred. However, the volume of new orders fell far short of the level required to prevent further magnification of the U.S. Navy fleet's alarming block obsolescence problem. The construction of merchant ships, as has been noted, continued at such a low level that the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies of the American merchant marine were further accentuated.

As a naval power, Russia is second only to the United States. The U.S. Navy's fleet is better balanced and possesses more versatile striking power. Russia, whose naval strategy stresses the submarine as the major element of her fleet strength, boasts the largest submarine fleet in the world. "Janes Fighting Ships," the authoritative naval journal, says the U.S.S.R. fleet comprises more than 430 submarines—a growing number of which are nuclear-powered attack and missile-firing types. The U.S. Navy has only 175 submarines, of which 51 are nuclear-powered units. As a point of reference, Hitler, in the early stages of World War II, decimated the Allies' supply lines with a total fleet of only 57 submarines.

The remarkable expansion of the U.S.S.R.'s merchant fleet stems from a series of continuing shipbuilding programs, which since 1950 have increased the fleet size from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1,200 vessels totaling 8 million tons today.

Currently underway is a 5-year plan (1965-70) which is programmed to increase the mer-

chant fleet's tonnage to 15 million deadweight by 1970.

By mid-1966 Russia's merchant marine, which already possesses more ships, will surpass the American fleet in terms of total tonnage. More importantly, the Russian fleet will be composed predominantly of new, efficient vessels while the U.S. merchant marine will be composed overwhelmingly of obsolete ships in the 25-year-old bracket.

The U.S.-flag fleet has been contracting steadily for the past 15 years. In 1951 it numbered 1,955 active vessels totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons. Today, this Nation has only 900 ships aggregating 13.5 million tons in active service.

The accompanying table, which compares the level of shipbuilding activity generated by the American and Soviet merchant marines, vividly reflects the contrasting maritime objectives.

Because Russian shipyards are heavily engaged in naval construction, 3.9 million of the 6.5 million tons of shipbuilding will be built outside of Russia.

Merchant ships building or on order

	Number	United States, deadweight tons ¹	Number	U.S.S.R., deadweight tons
Mar. 1, 1962	61	878,000	225	2,263,400
May 1, 1963	47	697,660	236	3,032,100
May 1, 1964	47	725,400	441	3,461,800
Nov. 1, 1964	43	650,000	673	3,450,000

¹ U.S. data: Shipbuilders Council of America.

² U.S.S.R. data: Marine Engineering Log, New York, N.Y.

³ U.S.S.R. data: Fairplay Shipping Journal, London, England.

Better Explanation of United States Vietnam Policy Than Anything Administration Has Put Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the April 24, 1965, issue of the Economist of London has a better, clearer, and more enlightening explanation of the U.S. position and policy in Vietnam than anything put out by anybody in the Johnson administration. I commend the Economist explanation to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

ALL WARS ARE FILTHY—BUT THE VIETNAM ONE IS GOING TO BE SETTLED BY CAREFUL PERSEVERANCE, NOT BY WRINGING ONE'S HANDS

That "filthy Fascist war" in Vietnam, as Mrs. Anne Kerr called it in Trafalgar Square on Monday, has reached a stage where high-pitched simplicities like Mrs. Kerr's have long since been overtaken by events. The honorable but confused member for Rochester and Chatham presumably wants the Americans to stop bombing North Vietnam, thus returning matters in South Vietnam to where they were at the beginning of February (which was two-thirds of the way down the slippery slope to a Vietcong victory). So do the rather haphazard collection of her fellow Labor Members of Parliament and other Labor Party supporters who assembled at the annual jamboree organized by the cooperative movement at Blackpool on Sunday. On the other side of the hill, there may be men in Washington

who still believe the war will be ended by somebody in Peiping flicking a switch and turning off the flow of revolutionary current that runs through Hanoi to the Vietcong. But it ought to be plain that the positions taken by the United States and China in the past 11 weeks virtually rule out both these extreme possibilities. Neither of the two great patron powers is in a mood to throw in the sponge completely without a major struggle.

What has been happening in the 11 weeks since the Americans started bombing North Vietnam is a gradual narrowing down of the range of likely outcomes, though the range still runs from the tolerably acceptable to the very undesirable. The central question is the part the rebels in the south will play in any future political settlement. Most people, looking at the guerrilla wars of the last 20 years, suspect that the Vietcong rebellion is probably too well established to be totally extirpated. It is entirely possible, on the other hand, that if it can be cut off from its sources of nourishment in the north it can be brought under control, as a fire sometimes is, without being actually put out. In that case the rebels' share in a future political settlement can probably be kept small enough for South Vietnam to remain outside the Communist camp. Other small countries with half-assimilated Communist minorities, like Finland and Burma, have managed to do just that, though the trick is harder to turn in Asia than in Europe. But if the attempt to cut the Vietcong off from its northern roots fails, it will pretty certainly be the Communists who dominate the final settlement. The only question then will be the speed with which it happens, and the degree of humiliation inflicted on the United States in the process.

(It might alternatively, as the optimists hope, be the beginning of a general retreat north of the 17th parallel, but nothing else the Communists have been doing confirms this hopeful reading.) The attempt at a showdown might come at an American base like Pleiku or even, if the Vietcong is ready to "try a Dienbienphu," at the Marines' laager at Da Nang. One rather hopes it will; Da Nang, on the coast, is not Dienbienphu in its pocket of hills, and the Americans are not the French. Or, alternatively, the attack might take the form of an attempt to cut communications between Da Nang and the south across the middle of the country.

If a major Vietcong offensive in the wet weather that begins soon does succeed in capturing an American base or cutting South Vietnam in two, the result will be more or less a foregone conclusion. Morale in the south, which has been rising in the last few weeks, will drop again; the old routine of coups d'état will be resumed; and the Americans will find themselves frighteningly near the end of the gangplank. If, on the other hand, the outcome is a big battle that the Vietcong loses, it will be North Vietnam's turn for an agonizing reappraisal. For the North Vietnamese would then face the prospect of being steadily bombed to pieces while the rebels in the south slowly pulled themselves together, regrouped, and thought out their tactics afresh. In that event the Americans' tactics would have been triumphantly justified: by forcing the Vietcong into a decisive battle before it was really ready, they might in effect have won the war.

The North Vietnamese have made it clear that the American bombing is not yet hurting them enough to persuade them to stop helping the rebels in the south. However, it is certainly hurting them enough for them not to want it to go on indefinitely. This gives them a powerful motive for urging the Vietcong to have a last great fling at winning the war in the south as soon as possible. The reported withdrawal of rebel forces from the southernmost part of the country may well be the sign of an impending last fling further north.

April 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150018-4
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2011

But it is quite likely that the rainy season will bring no decisive victory for either side. In that case the range of possibilities will narrow still further, and the conflict will settle down into a war of attrition that might drag on for a long time. The outcome of this war of attrition will depend, first, on the extent to which the recent rise in South Vietnamese morale can be put to practical use (Mr. McNamara, the American Secretary of Defense, has been arranging in Hawaii this week to train an extra 100,000 South Vietnamese troops). It will depend, second, on the extent to which the flow of aid to the Vietcong from the north can be diminished. If the North Vietnamese can be jostled into reducing the supply of recruits and arms in the hope of limiting the aerial pounding they have to take—or if they simply cannot get the supplies through because the bridges are down and the railway broken—time will probably work on the side of the Americans and the South Vietnamese. The Vietcong, deprived of its northern support, would gradually be cut down to its proper size as a native southern rebellion, and the way might at last be open to a political settlement that is not merely a case of the Communist north swallowing the south.

In this long and delicate operation, timing will be very important indeed. The sensible idea has been put forward—and informally approved of by the United States, Russia and Britain—of holding a conference about Cambodia's problems during which the interested parties could draw the conversation round to Vietnam. Cambodia said primly on Tuesday that any such conference should deal with Cambodia alone, but delegates in conference corridors have a way of getting round difficulties like that. No conference held in the near future is likely to produce a clear-cut solution of Vietnam's problems, unless one side or the other changes its position in a hurry. But informal conversations would be useful as a means of delaying the moment when either the Chinese or the Russians might feel obliged to involve themselves more directly. (Both have lately as good as said—the Russians on April 17 and the Chinese on April 20—that they will not send volunteers to North Vietnam unless the American bombing goes beyond its present limits.) Better still, the conversations could provide a way of delicately discovering what mixture of military stick and diplomatic carrot would be most effective in getting the North Vietnamese to cut down their aid to the Vietcong.

Senator FULBRIGHT called on April 18—echoing an earlier suggestion by Canada's Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson—for a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. The trouble with this course is that there is no evidence that the North Vietnamese would interpret it as anything but a sign of American vacillation; and, if an openly announced pause failed to bring a response from Hanoi, and the bombing started again, there would be a natural reluctance in Washington to repeat the experiment later on, when a halt might well be more fruitful. But these objections do not apply to a privately dropped American hint, whispered on the back row of a Cambodia conference, that the bombing might just stop for a week or so, without any public announcement whatever, to give the North Vietnamese a chance to reply in kind with an equally unpublicized halt in their assistance to the Vietcong. The same whispered conversation might include a spelling out of President Johnson's remark on March 25 about the conditions in which "the people and Government of South Vietnam" should be "free to settle their own future." This would begin to define the terms under which the southern rebels, once they were confined to real southerners, could join in the political dialog.

Shrill denunciation is simply no longer relevant to the Vietnam problem. The need now is for a careful use of military strength and diplomatic ingenuity, of determination coupled with an awareness of the value of treading cannily. The evidence suggests that President Johnson knows what is called for. One hopes the other side does too.

Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

MR. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert H. Feldkamp, one of the Nation's outstanding political writers, recently commented in his column in the Akron Beacon Journal about my position in regard to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The column follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By Robert H. Feldkamp)

Representative AYRES, of Akron, has decided to vote for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—which may raise some eyebrows.

The is the controversial section permitting States to enact their own right-to-work laws—laws which bar compulsory unionism.

AYRES, a Republican, confides he will be taking a position contrary to that generally expressed by his party on the touchy subject of right to work.

Couple AYRES' position with the fact that he is the ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee—where the repealer will first be considered, most likely this session—and it adds up to smooth sailing once the bill is thrown into the hopper.

This is doubly significant because labor has wanted to repeal 14(b) for nearly 20 years, but could never muster the strength in Congress.

This time, with AYRES' help, repeal is imminent.

AYRES and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the New York Democrat who heads the Education and Labor Committee, are working together.

Powell, in fact, is part of the reason that AYRES will support repeal.

The New Yorker knows that the bill probably will pass easily once it is reported out of committee. Democrats hold an overwhelming edge in Congress and most will go for it. And of the 435 House Members, only 124 come from the 19 States now having right-to-work laws—so no great opposition will develop there.

Powell knows that his greatest bargaining power comes while the bill still is in committee. So do labor chieftains, who dearly want repeal.

AFL-CIO President George Meany has a pledge from President Johnson—in return for a lot of help from labor during the last campaign—for help in killing 14(b).

Meany, however, must contend with Powell and that is what is happening now.

Powell, a Negro, long has been unhappy about the virtual exclusion of Negroes from union apprentice training programs. Ayres also has said publicly that qualified Negroes should be allowed into these programs.

Meany, it is understood, has promised Powell he will do all he can to break down these racial barriers—in return for fast committee action on 14(b).

This is where the matter now stands, and is part of the reason Ayres will line up with the Democrats.

He knows, too, that the Southern States now having right-to-work laws are using them as a magnet in attracting northern industries.

"Come on down," these Southern States are saying, "and you won't have to face compulsory union shops."

AYRES also remembers 1958 in Ohio of course, when Republicans who favored right to work were overwhelmed by labor-backed Democrats in almost every instance.

"The people of Ohio spoke out on this then, and were very clear," he says.

Mr. Speaker, I do not differ from the conclusions as drawn by Mr. Feldkamp; rather, I would elaborate and give the background of my position.

In 1958, when a right-to-work amendment was placed on our Ohio ballot, I publicly stated that I would not vote for it. I further stated that I felt that the U.S. Congress should face this issue.

Let no one feel that this is a reversal of position. I am a firm supporter of the Taft-Hartley Act and took a major part in the conference that brought about the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

I have always supported labor legislation that would provide the proper climate for fair bargaining. Excess of power by either party can but lead to disaster for both. I have always kept in mind that the general public had a great interest and that interest should have proper consideration.

There might be some who would infer that any movement to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would be an attack on that act itself. This is untrue.

There comes a time when experience brings about a review of some sections of what might be considered a very fair law.

Just a short time ago, I called for a review of the election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin. In two recent national union elections, loopholes in that law was found to exist—loopholes that permitted fraudulent or confusing action. The right of union members to conduct fair elections is paramount.

The Landrum-Griffin Act was drawn so as to give protection to union members that might, on occasion, be beset by autocratic leadership. It is a fine law but improvements, in this one direction, might be made. I would still protect the Landrum-Griffin Act as I still would protect the Taft-Hartley Act.

An organization that is disputing the repeal of section 14(b), falsely charges that this repeal would force every employee to join a union and pay dues. To clear up this misconception, I am detailing the actual effect of the repeal of section 14(b).

As I recently covered this subject in a speech, I do now include excerpts from my remarks pertaining to this subject:
IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSALS TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b)

Section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley authorizes the States to limit or completely prohibit any form of compulsory union membership arrangement. Nineteen of the fifty States

A2012

have enacted such statutes, popularly known as right-to-work laws.

There seems to be a widespread misconception that in the 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws union membership is compulsory for employees in organized enterprises. This is utterly erroneous.

Compulsory union membership results exclusively from voluntary contracts entered into between employers and labor unions during the course of free collective bargaining. Nothing in either Federal or State law compels an employee to join a union or an employer to consent to an agreement with a union which would require his employees to join the union as a condition of retaining their jobs.

In other words, compulsory union membership, where it exists, is a result of free and voluntary agreement between employer and union, and is not a requirement imposed by law. If 14(b) were to be repealed, thus nullifying State right-to-work laws, nevertheless, no employee could be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job, unless his employer voluntarily agreed to including such a requirement in his contract with the union.

If section 14(b) were to be repealed, the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act permitting union security arrangements would then apply uniformly in all of the 50 States.

Again there seems to be a widespread misconception that this would have the effect of imposing unrestricted compulsory union membership on all employees in organized enterprises. This, too, is erroneous. The provision in Taft-Hartley permitting employers and unions to agree to union security arrangements is an extremely limited one.

The closed shop, which requires the employer to hire only those job applicants who are already members of the union, would still be unlawful. And employees required to join the union after getting their jobs [this is known as the union shop] could not be deprived of their jobs even if they lose their membership in the union, unless such loss of membership were the result of a refusal to pay their dues or initiation fee. Loss or denial of union membership for any other reason would not be a lawful reason for the employee's loss of his job.

Hence, apart from the requirement to pay union dues and initiation fees, the employee required to join the union would have no other obligations to the union as a condition of holding his job.

Repeal of 14(b) would leave the fundamental scheme of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts unchanged.

The Wagner Act which remained on the statute books substantially unchanged from 1935 to 1947, was limited to protecting employees against any attempt by their employers to interfere with their membership in or activities in behalf of their unions. No other safeguards for employees were provided, nor were there any protections provided for employers against any type of union misconduct.

The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, provided protections for employers against certain types of union conduct such as secondary boycotts, certain types of picketing, jurisdictional dispute strikes, etc. Moreover, the closed shop was completely outlawed, and only the limited type of union shop described above was permitted even in those States without right-to-work laws. None of these new safeguards would be affected in any way by the repeal of 14(b).

In 1959, the Landrum-Griffin Act became law. This strengthened the ban on secondary boycotts, outlawed hot-cargo contracts, and prohibited organizational, recognition, and extortionate picketing. These additional safeguards for employers and employees would not be changed by repeal of 14(b). Moreover, the new provisions establishing a bill of rights for union members,

protecting union funds against misuse, erecting certain safeguards for the conduct of union elections, similarly would remain unaffected by repeal of 14(b).

Thus it is plain that repeal of 14(b) would result in no fundamental or significant modification in the structure and safeguards which the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts have made available to rank-and-file union members, employees, and employers.

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN AND THE PUZZLING DEFENSE

As the last 1964 issue of the Newsletter was going to press, Justice William J. Brennan, of the U.S. Supreme Court was busily defending his opinion in the June 22 "Lovers" and "Tropic of Cancer" decisions.

Mr. Justice Brennan, in the June 22 opinion, defined community standards (a test since 1957 in obscenity cases) as a national standard, referring to society at large, thus indicating that the test for obscenity should rest on the lowest possible common denominator of morality.

In a November 15 speech at the Louis Marshall Award Dinner of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, Justice Brennan chose to defend his position and succeeded only in compounding the confusion which the Court's June 22 decisions created.

Mr. Justice Brennan quoted from Leclercq: "The jurist is above all interested in social good, in rules to be observed in view of that good; the moralist is preoccupied with the good of the individual." He quickly went on to say, "It is not necessary to accept the proposition as invariably true to recognize its validity in some cases." He hurried on to demonstrate, that he is aware that there is such a thing as a public, social morality, even indicating that it is at a higher level than his June 22 opinion would have us believe: it is a mistaken notion that judges are not as fully conscious as men of religion that our institutions reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people * * *. Judges in fact daily administer innumerable laws which enact moral standards fashioned by theologians. But there are constitutional limits to the legislative power even in the areas of religion and morality.

Operation Yorkville submits that Justice Brennan's June 22 opinion does not reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people, and raises a question as to his ideas of the individual good and even the social good. Further, the Court's reading of the Constitution has seemed strained and overdoctrinaire in the area of publications. Why? Mr. Justice Brennan went on in his speech: "The line between protected and unprotected portrayal is dim and uncertain." This, in spite of the fact that we are a religious people. Mr. Brennan's opinion has helped render the line even dimmer and more uncertain. Where to now, Mr. Justice Brennan?

NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE RELEASES NEW VD REPORT—CITES SALACIOUS LITERATURE AS CAUSE OF TEENAGE VD RISE

In a report released on February 4, the New York Academy of Medicine outlined steps to aid in the eradication of venereal disease in 7 years. The plan called for public sex education programs.

The Committee on Public Health of the New York Academy of Medicine, noting that the incidence of venereal disease among teenagers has increased more than 200 percent between 1956 and 1963 (on a nationwide basis), said that education on prevention of infection should be directed to teenagers in the form of sex education. "The fact is that teenagers are receiving an enormous amount of sex education—of the wrong kind. A large part of this education is derived from salacious literature.

"This kind of literature, which is motivated by the desire for profit, makes vice attractive. It is intentionally sex-arousing and therefore conducive to illicit intercourse and promiscuity which, in turn, helps to spread venereal disease. Health forces in the campaign against venereal disease should recognize the magnitude of distribution and financial resources of publishers of salacious literature and should recognize this type of material as a powerful competitor, the committee believes. Health forces should oppose salacious literature and counter with oppor-

Operation Yorkville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 980, the bill overwhelmingly approved by this distinguished body, to stop the free flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails, I would like to call attention to an interfaith group in New York City which has done an extraordinary job of fighting smut in that community. I am speaking of Operation Yorkville. The efforts of this outstanding group of interested citizens have alerted others throughout the United States to the dangers of the availability of obscene and pornographic material to our young people.

This interfaith campaign is organized to protect the parental-civil right to stop the traffic in pornography among children by expressing community standards.

I am certain my distinguished colleagues join in commending this very worthwhile organization for their untiring efforts in the war against obscenity.

The following articles taken from the March issue of the Operation Yorkville Newsletter point up the problem which exists and show what can be done and what is being done about this most serious problem:

LETTER POWER (LP) IS PEACEFUL PROTEST— PROTEST AGAINST THE VIOLATION OF YOUR RIGHTS TO EDUCATE AND PROTECT

The problem of the traffic in pornography among children is your problem, and only you can begin the cycle which will result in the protection of your parental-civil right to educate and protect.

Police will not arrest, district attorneys will not prosecute, many judges will continue to rule in favor of pornographers—unless you protest.

Letter writing is protest, peaceful but forceful protest. Letter writing can be the power of the people, which when applied, can tip the scales of justice in favor of innocent children.

The cycle is simple, but effective. Letter protests to the press (to one newspaper, so that the greatest force will be directed to one point) will result in conflict in the press—conflict between parents and pornographers. Conflict will result in news; news will stimulate editorial coverage; editorial coverage will spur law enforcement, prosecution, and judgments, which will reflect regard for your rights and, in so doing, protect the innocent from perversion.

You can help start the wheels of justice turning. You can use the machinery of peaceful protest—use your letter power. Begin writing your newspaper as soon as possible.

April 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150018-4
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2019

to tomorrow, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story as published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Today's articles cover the research spectrum and materials.

THE RESEARCH SPECTRUM

A decided advantage to the establishment of new industries is the diversity of the Pittsburgh area's research and development efforts.

Pittsburgh research laboratories are especially strong in the materials, nucleonics, chemicals, electronics, and instruments fields, but they also are engaged in a variety of other R. & D. activities.

Many of the larger companies—such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., United States Steel Corp., and Gulf Research & Development Co.—are active in almost all the principal fields. More often, however, the research and development efforts are more specialized, tailored to a company's product line in a single field or two.

Pittsburgh's three major universities—and Mellon Institute—conduct research in most of the disciplines. Although much of this work is of a basic nature, many of the programs have applications that merit industrial scrutiny.

This section discusses some of the principal R. & D. areas, major laboratories, specialized equipment, interesting projects, and significant results of Pittsburgh's scientific and technical efforts.

The description is far from complete, but serves merely to illustrate the nature, growth, and direction of research and development in the nine-county area. More detailed information about each company's R. & D. activities can be found in the research directory on pages 33 to 47.

MATERIALS

Historically, Pittsburgh has been a materials center. More new materials and processing techniques have been developed in the area than in any other section of the United States.

Although the region's research and development activities have been broadened considerably, new and better materials and processes still command the largest volume of R. & D. efforts.

These activities range from research in such traditional areas as steel, aluminum, coal, refractories, ceramics, and glass, to pioneering work in alloys, nuclear fuels, and exotic materials.

Basic studies into the nature of metals and alloys are conducted at Mellon Institute, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and University of Pittsburgh, as well as industrial laboratories.

On the applied research scene, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. is improving upon its vacuum melting technique breakthrough; MSA Research Corp. is experimenting with new liquid metals; and Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp. is studying ways to fabricate refractory metals in an inert atmosphere.

Semi-Elements, Inc., is developing single crystals of metals; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co. is working on extremely high temperature refractories; Magnetics, Inc., is producing new magnetic materials; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is exploring deep-drawing structures made of glass; and Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp. is perfecting new nuclear fuel materials.

Some of the most diversified materials research is being carried on at companies primarily in other fields, such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., which is involved in semiconductor, nuclear fuel, and other advanced materials research.

The largest and most numerous Pittsburgh materials laboratories are engaged in metals and alloys research. Among the extensive

metallurgical facilities in the area are those of United States Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Latrobe Steel Co., Crucible Steel Co. of America, Dravo Corp., Blaw-Knox Co., Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co., Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp., St. Joseph Lead Co., Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Co., Firth Sterling, Inc., MSA Research Corp., and Copperweld Steel Co.

The Pittsburgh area also has a heavy R. & D. concentration in refractories, ceramics, and glass. Some of the better known facilities are the Carborundum Co., Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., McDowell Refractory Porcelain Co., Du-Co Ceramics Co., Findlay Refractories Co., Kennametal, Inc., O. Hommel Co., Saxonburg Ceramics, Inc., Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., American Optical Co., and American Glass Research, Inc.

All aspects of coal technology are explored at the Bureau of Mines, Consolidation Coal Co., Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., Koppers Co., United States Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Chemical Co.

Improved polymers and coatings are R. & D. objectives at such companies as Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp., H. H. Robertson Co., Koppers Co., Mobil Finishes Co., Mobay Chemical Co., Neville Chemical Co., Thompson & Co., Watson-Standard Co., and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

in general, Victory is providing valuable assistance to a neighboring county.

Last month, at the hospital's annual meeting of the board of trustees, George A. Aliano, an attorney and distinguished civic leader, was elected to an unprecedented 16th consecutive 1-year term as president of Victory Memorial. As a result of his dedicated efforts and the close cooperation of the entire board and the professional and nonprofessional staffs, the hospital has witnessed steady and healthy growth over the past several years.

I think it is noteworthy to point out that Victory's west wing was dedicated to the 134 south Brooklyn men killed in action in World War I and that the east wing was dedicated in memory of those servicemen from Bay Ridge who gave their lives during World War II and the Korean conflict.

It is in the name of these heroic men that Victory Memorial carries on its humane and essential programs in the unceasing war against disease and travail.

Harry Truman, Man of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 13, 1965, carried an editorial tribute to Harry S. Truman which rates with the best ever written about the great man from Independence, Mo.

The theme of this editorial is that Former President Truman grows in stature with the passage of time because his decisions in the years of world crisis immediately following World War II have taken on added luster under the test of time. Few leaders have been fully appreciated during their lifetime and many have been maligned by the second guessers of history. But the swift passage of events, trying the mettle and courage of free people everywhere in our world, have adequately justified the Truman years in little more than a decade.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD, the editorial:

HARRY TRUMAN, MAN OF DECISION

As time passes and as we see the recent past in fuller perspective, former President Harry S. Truman grows in stature.

We realize that Mr. Truman built the very foundations of America's new, powerful foreign policy after World War II, and mobilized all the free world behind it.

Tonight Mr. Truman will go to the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. There Freedom House will present to him its Freedom Award on the 20th anniversary of his first day in the Presidency.

It will be a reunion for the doughty Missourian. Most of his last Cabinet will be there. So will many men who played important parts in the dramatic and momentous years, 1945 to 1952, when Mr. Truman and they were together winning a war, rebuilding a world and trying to find paths to permanent peace,

A2020

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 28, 1965

No President since Mr. Truman has made more than minor changes in the foreign policy for which he took full responsibility. The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the Korean intervention, the revival of war-stricken nations—these are still the chief girders of America's free world leadership.

On each of these policies Mr. Truman made the final decisions. So he did on dropping the nuclear bomb, too.

He consulted others, but in the end, on the lonely spot of the ultimate decisionmaker, he stuck to his resolute policy: "The buck stops here."

The late Cleveland mayor, Tom L. Johnson, once said with rueful humor: "A good executive is one who can make decisions, and is sometimes right."

Mr. Truman made some of the most crucial decisions any President, and any man in world history, has had to make. And we honor him because he was right so much of the time.

Vietnam Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has once again contributed distinguished reporting and thoughtful, sober comment on the Vietnam situation. On April 18, Barnard L. Collier filed a story from Johnson City, Tex., which vividly describes the President's delivery to the press of his Easter message, and the following day the Herald Tribune commented on the situation editorially. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include these two articles:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 19, 1965]

BRICKBATS THROUGH THE WINDOW

The United States, in President Johnson's words, "tried to open a window to peace." But the Communists responded, much as Communist-inspired mobs have responded to American overtures, by heaving brickbats through the window. On the very day that Mr. Johnson was repeating his offer of unconditional negotiations, the Soviet Union announced that Mr. Johnson "does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

What are those avenues? The Communists of Red China, North Vietnam and the Soviet Union know only a single avenue: one which leads the United States out of Vietnam. And that avenue, Mr. Johnson has again and again made plain, the United States will not tread—until a peaceful solution is reached.

In other words, the Communists do not want unconditional negotiations but unconditional surrender of the Saigon government. The United States, for its part, cannot sacrifice the people who have been fighting on against the imported revolt that is intended to bring about the end of their independence. Once that independence is assured, the United States is prepared to leave South Vietnam.

The Soviet communique, after the Moscow talks between the Russians and the North Vietnamese, leaves the suspicion that the Soviet Union will take a hand in escalating the war. The reference to Soviet "volun-

teers," while veiled and "iffy," could imply that Soviet troops will man Soviet antiaircraft missiles in North Vietnam, since sites for such weapons are apparently under preparation. On the other hand, the communiqué can be interpreted to be a threat, a warning, that may or may not be implemented.

But what the Soviet communique clearly is not is an affirmative answer to President Johnson's offer to negotiate. Until such an answer is forthcoming, the more or less well-intentioned Americans who have been demonstrating against their country's policy in Vietnam as a threat to peace are delivering their message to the wrong address.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 8, 1965]

JOHNSON RENEWS VIET PLEDGE: ALWAYS READY FOR PEACE TALKS BUT "NO POWER CAN FORCE US OUT"

(By Barnard L. Collier)

JOHNSON CITY, TEX.—In a somber Easter message, President Johnson warned yesterday that "no human power is capable of forcing us from Vietnam." But he still held out the offer of unconditional peace talks with the Communists "next week, tomorrow, or tonight."

After the President spoke, the Soviet Union announced that it will permit Russian "volunteers" to fight in Vietnam if "U.S. aggression against the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam is intensified" and if Hanoi requests such aid. The Moscow statement charged that the United States is "extending aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution."

The Soviet announcement in a Soviet-North Vietnamese communique, appeared not to have been in response to the President's statement.

The President spoke from the porch of the LBJ Ranch. He was as serious as reporters have seen him in months.

"If the price of victory in Vietnam is blood and men, we are willing to pay that price," he declared.

"They want no talk with us," he said grimly, summing up Communist reaction so far to his April 7 peace talk proposals. "But our offer stands. The window to peace is still open."

In an implied appeal to America's allies and to neutrals to press for peace talks, he said he hoped that "a mounting crescendo of world opinion, weary of war, opposed to aggression, will finally find a way to reach the ears of those now deaf to calls for peace."

Hours earlier, U.S. planes had lashed highways and a railroad in North Vietnam for the second straight day—and South Vietnamese planes dropped 100,000 leaflets carrying the President's April 7 peace talk proposals and his picture on the North Vietnamese city of Dong Hoi.

The Moscow communique, issued after talks between North Vietnamese Communist party secretary Le Kuan and Soviet officials, said Russia would "continue rendering all necessary assistance" to the North Vietnamese against United States aggression. A Soviet antiaircraft missile site is reported under construction near Hanoi; Russians are in the country and high-altitude surface-to-air (SAM) missiles are believed on the way.

Moscow has spoken previously of "many volunteers"—a Communist euphemism for trained troops—anxious to fight in Vietnam but gave no indication whether they would be permitted to go. The new announcement—with the provisos that the United States intensifies the war and North Vietnam asks for the help—was the furthest the Soviets have gone on the "volunteer" question.

The communique specifically scoffed at the President's April 7 speech as showing that "the United States is still keeping a course

for the extension of acts of aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

In Washington, Secretary of State Dean Rusk announced that the United States had "thought long and soberly" about suspending the raids on North Vietnam that began February 7 but had concluded that such action "would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends."

Prime Ministers Lester Pearson of Canada and Lal Bahadur Shastri of India, among others, have suggested that the North Vietnamese might respond by relaxing their guerrilla war if the raids were suspended. But Mr. Rusk, in a statement, said that "we have tried publicly and privately to find out if this would be the result, and there has been no response."

President Johnson in his message expressed regret "that the necessities of war have forced us to bomb North Vietnam." But he emphasized that the raids have been directed at military and strategic targets, "at concrete and steel and not human life."

"I understand the feelings of those who regret that we must undertake air attacks," Mr. Johnson said. "I share those feelings."

"But the compassion of this country, and the world, must go out to the men, women and children who are killed and crippled by the Vietcong every day in South Vietnam. The outrage of this country, and the world, must be visited on those who explode their bombs in cities and villages, ripping the bodies of the helpless."

He added soberly:

"Let us remember that the people of South Vietnam, and the Americans who share their struggle, suffer because they are attacked—not because they are attackers."

The President, who was flanked by Mrs. Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, began his message by saying: "This has been a week of tragedy, disappointment and progress."

"On this, of all weekends, we must feel a deep sadness that men must still die and families still be left homeless in the brutality of war," he said. He expressed sorrow for the death of Joseph W. Grainger, the U.S. aid official whose murder by his Vietcong captors was disclosed last week, and for "all the others, on both sides, who found this week to be their last."

A strong theme of the message was the President's expressed disappointment—at the rejection of his April 7 proposal for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, at the continued loss of American and Vietnamese lives and at the angry censure, in some parts of the world and among some Americans, of his orders to bomb North Vietnam.

The April 7 proposals have been denounced by Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow. Red China and North Vietnam also turned down visits to their capitals by former British Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, on a diplomatic sounding mission, and indicated to United Nations Secretary General U Thant that visits by Mr. Thant would serve little purpose.

"We tried to open a window to peace," Mr. Johnson said, "only to be met with tired names and slogans—and a refusal to talk."

"They want no talks with us—no talk with a distinguished Briton—and no talk with the United Nations. They want no talk at all—so far. But our offer stands. We mean every word of it."

"The window to peace is still open. We are still ready for unconditional discussion. We will impose no conditions, of any kind, on any government willing to talk. Nor will we accept any. On this basis we are ready to begin discussion next week, tomorrow or tonight."

Mr. Johnson ended on a dead-serious note. "It is not easy to engage in a struggle whose beginning is obscure and whose end is not

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2021

in sight," he said. "Peace, like war, requires patience and the courage to go on despite discouragement."

"Yet we must go on. For there is a world to lose, a world of peace, of order and of expanding promise for all who live therein."

He then murmured "thank you" to the assembled reporters, walked over to put his arm around Mrs. Johnson and kiss her on the forehead and disappeared into the ranch-house. Reporters could remember no other time when he had not lingered after a formal statement to banter with the press.

Helicopter Service in New York**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. LEONARD FARSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the President's budget message called for an end to Federal subsidies in support of passenger helicopter operations throughout the country. I question whether such immediate withdrawal of support is the wisest move at this point in the development of helicopter service.

To quote a New York Times editorial of February 6:

Any Government subsidy must, of course, be submitted to unremitting review. But it would be most unfortunate and shortsighted to stop the subsidy of helicopter passenger service at this stage. For one thing, the Pan Am heliport itself, because of its great convenience, should encourage an immediate increase in passenger use to make trips to airports in 5 to 10 minutes that might require an hour or more by highway. If, as likely, the proposed new fourth major airport in the area is situated even further away, the helicopter's time advantage will be enhanced.

While the helicopter service would probably be unable to exist this year or next without support, it seems that the great increase in recent years of public support and usage points to a time in the very near future when such service would be able to pay for itself. New York Airways when it started its operations 12 years ago carried approximately 25 passengers daily. Today that figure is up to 1,000 daily. As recently as 1958 subsidies received were 72.9 percent of all revenues received by New York Airways. In 1964 other commercial income had grown so that only 45 percent of all revenues came from Government subsidy. In 1965, this will drop to 34.8 percent and in subsequent years it will fall to 23.6 percent, finally in 1970 to 3.5 percent.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed a plan for ending subsidy which takes account of this attenuating need as well as the requirement of Government economy. This program would gradually phase out aid to the heliports between now and 1970 and offer only the barest subsidy needed to match increasing profits.

I support this plan because I believe it will enable the needed convenience of helicopter service to survive, yet will call

for the minimum of Federal funds necessary to do this.

We must remember that we have a large investment in this service. The Federal Government has spent \$46.7 million in the past 11 years in fostering the growth of the program. To cut off aid now would be to nip it in the bud and render our previous investment useless. The Civil Aeronautics Board program would call for a small amount of additional funds to complete our investment and would allow that investment to reap the dividend of self-sufficient service that was our original goal and which promises to be an imminent reality.

proceed with increased effectiveness. It is evident that an even closer relationship has been cemented between these two great communities.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD two articles from the Baltimore, Md., Sun of March 31, 1965, concerning this program:

RIO PICKS TAWES FOR SCHOOL TITLE

ANNAPOLIS, April 10.—Governor Tawes has been advised that a school is being named for him in the State of Rio de Janeiro.

Rio is a sister State of Maryland in the Partners of Alliance program initiated by the State Department.

Gov. Paulo Torres of the State of Rio advised the Maryland Governor of the honor planned for him. Tawes had given a dinner in Annapolis recently honoring two members of the State of Rio Partners Committee who were visiting Maryland.

Governor Tawes expressed appreciation in a letter to Governor Torres and said he hoped the naming of a Rio school for a Maryland citizen will "help to cement the close relationship" being developed between the two States.

STATE GROUP AIDS BRAZIL—MARYLAND DOLLARS HELP PROVIDE SLUM AREA SCHOOLS

Maryland dollars are helping put slum children in school in the State of Rio in Brazil, a Brazilian visitor said yesterday.

This is one of a number of projects aided by Marylanders in the Partners of Alliance program, sponsored by the Agency for International Development. Maryland is 1 of 20 States which has been linked up with a Latin American counterpart.

At a press conference, Ronald Hees, 33, said the enlargement of one school and the building of another in the slums of Niteroy, the capital of the State of Rio, has enabled many slum children to attend school.

TOTAL OF \$1,300 GIVEN

Money to help enlarge the one and help build the other came from the Maryland committee. A total of \$1,300 was given.

The chairman of the Maryland committee, appointed by Governor Tawes, is Albert Berney, president of Hamburger's Men Store. Other officers who attended the press conference are Wallace Lanahan, vice chairman, president of Stein Bros. & Boyce, investment bankers; and Julian Stein, secretary, a public relations counsel.

Mr. Stein said that the Maryland help was designed to "help the Brazilians help themselves."

Birthday of Tanzania**SPEECH**

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today, on April 26, the new African Nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous task of forging the two countries into a single nation.

To the people of that new nation, Tanzania, and to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, I wish to extend my best wishes for the future, and congratulations for what has been done in 1 year.

All Americans must feel admiration for the daring concepts that were given reality a year ago. Our own history of a

A2022

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 28, 1965

struggle toward a concept which many said could not be attained, makes it obvious to us that this young nation has many trials and tribulations in the days ahead. That it will come through successfully and attain the destiny ordained for a people loving freedom is the hope of all Americans on this day.

Robert Uihlein Receives Milwaukee Press Community Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday it was my distinct pleasure to have attended the annual Gridiron Dinner of the Milwaukee Press Club.

On that occasion, the Milwaukee Press Club presented its 1965 award for community service to Mr. Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.

Mr. Uihlein has richly merited this recognition for his many contributions to the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin. Among specific civic deeds has been the outstanding support which he, his family, and his firm have given to Milwaukee's proposed Center for the Performing Arts. Further, his sponsorship of the annual Fourth of July parade has made Milwaukee the place to be in the United States on Independence Day.

In addition to the citation presented to Mr. Uihlein, awards were presented to newspaper men and women in the community for outstanding journalistic achievement.

In order to bring the accomplishments of Mr. Uihlein and the members of the Milwaukee press to the attention of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the Record at this point excerpts from news stories on the Gridiron dinner which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on Monday, April 26.

UIHLEIN DECLARES "CITY ON THE MOVE"

Milwaukee was described Sunday night as a "community which is really on the move" by Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. Uihlein made the remarks after receiving the Milwaukee Press Club's 1965 award for community service at the club's ninth annual Gridiron Dinner in the Wisconsin Club.

"I'm very excited about the way Milwaukee is moving these days," Uihlein said. He specifically mentioned the downtown urban renewal underway and new businesses which have started.

"Wisconsin, and more particularly Milwaukee, is on the way to great things. It's fun to be a member of a great community like Milwaukee," he concluded.

Uihlein, 49, was honored for his contributions to sports and cultural activities as well as for his role in the brewing industry. He was cited for his support of the proposed Center for the Performing Arts, to which his firm and family have contributed \$1 million; his sponsorship of the city's annual Fourth of July circus parade and fireworks display and numerous other cultural and sporting events.

The dinner, at which events of 1964 were lampooned through song and playlet, was attended by many governmental figures. Included were Governor Knowles, Lieutenant Governor Lucey, Attorney General La Follette, State Treasurer Dena Smith, Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat of Milwaukee, Representative DAVIS, Republican, of New Berlin, Mayor Maier, County Executive Doyne; Fred H. Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin; Associate Justice Thomas Fairchild of the State supreme court and others.

WRITING AWARDS, 10 CATEGORIES

Best newspaper story by a rewrite man, "Wild Bank Robbery," James G. Wieghart, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written under deadline pressure, "School Boycott," Laurie Van Dyke, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written without immediate deadline pressure, "Posed as Negro," H. W. Quick, the Sentinel.

Best single story or series on a specialized field of knowledge, including stories on science, business, agriculture, homemaking, art, books, religion, medicine, travel, etc. "The Computer Age," Bob Blackwell, the Sentinel.

Best single feature story, "Expressway Signs," Paul G. Hayes, the Journal.

Best single sports story, "Car Race," Mike Kupper, the Journal.

Best single editorial or editorial cartoon, "Labeling Ludicrousness," Thomas A. Blinkhorn, the Journal.

Best example of continuous reporting on a single subject, in series form or as individual stories, "Public Schools and the Negroes," Ralph Olive, the Journal.

Best single story or series of articles making a contribution to the welfare of the community or State, "Death Rides the Highways," Frank A. Aukofer, the Journal.

Newspaper headline award, based on submission of no more than six headlines with stories attached, Leonard Scheier, the Journal. (The judging took into account how accurately and interestingly the headline summed up the story, plus the writer's versatility.)

PHOTOGRAPHY, FOUR CATEGORIES

Spot news photography, "River Drama," Robert Boyd, the Sentinel.

Documentary photography, "Buck Fever," James Stanfield, the Journal.

Sports photography, "Stock Car Race Crash," Ron Overdahl, West Alli. Star.

Feature photography, "Student Requirements," James Stanfield, the Journal.

TV AND RADIO NEWS

Best television spot news, "School Boycott," WITI-TV.

Best television documentary or series, "Our War Babies Go to College," WITI-TV.

Best radio spot news, "Bank Holdup," WOKY radio.

Best radio documentary or series, "Douglas MacArthur Obituary," WTMJ radio.

Best radio-television editorial, "Stand on Police Brutality Charges," WITI-TV.

Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, New

York, N.Y., held their annual dinner on Sunday, April 25, and the proceeds of this dinner will be donated to charitable organizations.

Mr. Christopher Moody was chairman of the dinner and justice of the criminal courts, Alfred J. Cawse, was the recipient of the achievement award given each year to an outstanding citizen for his contributions to the Borough of Richmond. George "Timmy" Allen, senior in McKee High School was the winner of the sports award as Staten Island's outstanding high school basketball player. Councilman Robert G. Lindsay and Justice Frank Paulo, surrogate of Richmond County, were other guests of honor. Borough president, Albert V. Maniscalco, expressed the greetings of the city of New York and introduced me as principal speaker.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE BROWN BOMBER SOCIAL CLUB, APRIL 25

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I want to talk to you briefly about education; but don't get in a panic and start looking for the exits; I'm not here as a professor—a calling, incidentally, that someone once described as getting paid to study the sleeping habits of students—but I do want to leave a few thoughts with you on education as an opportunity and as a challenge.

As you know, only 2 weeks ago President Johnson—once a teacher himself—signed into law the \$1.3 billion aid-to-education bill, the greatest single advance in the war on ignorance that this country has ever made. It was an honor and a privilege for me to contribute my vote to the passage of this bill through Congress.

As the President said when he affixed his signature to this historic measure, "It will bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most; put the best educational equipment and innovations within reach of all students; advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers, and provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning."

Specifically, the bill is aimed at breaking the cycle of ignorance and poverty by giving special help to children from low-income families. Its main section authorizes the grant of \$1.08 billion to the States for the benefit of about 5 million children in families earning under \$2,000 a year.

It will provide additional millions to aid school libraries and buy publicly approved textbooks for children in public, private and parochial schools; to start a 5-year program for the establishment of educational and cultural centers such as science laboratories and reading clinics; and to aid educational research and training designed to improve the quality of teaching in grade and high schools.

But let me put it in human terms:

We Americans always pride ourselves on the availability and quality of our public education. For most of us, it is available and it is of good quality. But to hundreds of thousands of families in areas where poverty was and is a bitter reality—and these families and areas know no color line and no State lines—public education often is just barely available and too often of substandard quality.

For instance, recent educational research has shown that alarming numbers of these disadvantaged children are hopelessly behind, scholastically, by the time they struggle into the third or fourth grade. They must have preschool training in order to start on even

April 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2031

(C) FLORIDA

Welded wire mesh, 6 by 6-10/10, \$135 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 10-gage steel wire, \$160 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

The eminent steel economist, Prof. Walter Adams, of Michigan State University, recently said that without the independent wire drawer "We would have an oligopolistic managed economy (in the steel wire industry)." The persistence of the independents is necessary, in the public interest, as the only means—short of regulation or public ownership—of injecting a suitable measure of fluidity into the steel price structure."

It is apparent from this brief analysis of the steel wire and wire products industry that the vertical oligopoly power of the integrated steel producers has tended to keep prices artificially high, which, in turn, has contributed to this Nation's adverse balance-of-payments position by forcing independents to buy imported steel.

The independent wire drawers have displayed direct, vigorous, and dynamic competitive effort—this competitive effort is in the public interest of maintaining a free competitive marketplace. If the integrated steel producers had followed the example of the major auto producers by meeting import competition directly in the marketplace rather than running to Washington, there would have been no need for the independents to use imported steel, and the industry, the public, and the Nation would have benefited.

The Roosevelt bill would require fair pricing behavior in dual distribution industries. The Roosevelt bill is not an indirect subsidy for inefficient independent producers; in the fabricating segment of the steel industry scientific evidence proves that independent fabricators one one-hundredth the size of their integrated rivals have been capable of competing effectively with the giants—when ever allowed to do so in free and open competition.

The independent wire drawers and fabricators do not want special favors or subsidies from the Federal Government—all we ask is preservation of the marketplace—free from squeeze tactics and monopolistic sharpshooting.

Young Americans for Freedom—Vietnam Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the John R. Pillion chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, in Buffalo, N.Y., endorses the strong position taken by President Johnson in dealing with the Vietcong Communists.

In support of the President's action, the members of this chapter have circulated petitions in Buffalo which already include more than 1,000 signatures. These petitions, together with the Vietnam policy statement of the Young Americans for Freedom, are being forwarded to the President so that he can be apprised of this group's efforts in support of the course he is pursuing in this troubled area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, their Vietnam policy statement follows:

VIETNAM POLICY STATEMENT

Young Americans for Freedom is proud of President Johnson's strong and effective actions against the Communists in Vietnam.

There are many influential parties exerting maximum pressure on the President to retreat and negotiate in Vietnam. In this morning's newspaper, we read of Democratic Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging the President to temporarily halt air strikes against North Vietnam because he is "pessimistic about the outcome of the situation in Vietnam if there is no attempt at negotiations." This is not an isolated case. Students and Communists have marched on Washington to picket the White House; college professors and university senators have sponsored rallies and marathon teach-ins urging withdrawal; Senators WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and ERNEST Gruening, of Alaska, have delivered vehement tirades against the President's southeast Asian policy of containment; Senators FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota, have made severe attacks on Mr. Johnson; and other powerful agitators continue a furious onslaught of peace-at-any-price propaganda. Moreover, such irresponsible conduct is increasing at a shocking pace.

Americans must assure Mr. Johnson that he is not alone in the cause of freedom. It is our patriotic and moral duty to stand by our President in this hour of great crisis.

We must not relent our traditional duty to defend liberty. We must not capitulate even in the face of defeat. We must not succumb to threats of a full-scale war. We must not forsake the people of southeast Asia to the barbarous invasions of the Atlantic Red Chinese. We must not abandon the South Vietnamese to the inhumane atrocities of communism.

The American people's will to fight for freedom—not only for ourselves, but for all the people of the world—has been demonstrated in the past and must be reasserted now.

Outstanding anti-Communists such as Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, and our own Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI are to be congratulated for their stanch and resolute positions in this crucial situation. As they know and have repeatedly said, we must win—we can win—and we will win.

KENNETH K. MAHER, JR. Chairman.

LOUIS MARANO,
Director of Young Americans for Freedom.

California State Senator Introduces Resolutions for Study of Nature's Destructive Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, gave a speech in which he suggested that the great ingenuity and resources of the aerospace team in California should be channeled to provide some sources or at least unravel some of the unknowns concerning the destructive forces of nature such as storms, earthquakes, fires, and floods.

State Senator Alvin C. Weingand recently announced that he plans to introduce resolutions in the State legislature to accomplish this purpose.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator Weingand's press release which indicates the great promise of this approach to some of the problems which have plagued mankind for many years.

The press release follows:

CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR INTRODUCES RESOLUTIONS FOR STUDY OF NATURE'S DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

Senator Alvin C. Weingand announced today he will introduce resolutions calling for studies by California aerospace firms into the mysteries of the destructive forces of nature—storm, earthquake, fire, and flood.

Senator Weingand, Democrat, of Santa Barbara, said the legislation represents an expansion of the State's pioneering efforts to direct California aerospace industry talent to pressing State problems.

It would authorize preliminary feasibility studies into the causes, control, and prevention of natural phenomena as well as into the long-range forecasting of State recreational needs.

"I believe that if the genius of California's space age talent can find ways to rocket a man to the moon, it can also begin to give us some answers to help us control the destructive forces of nature," Senator Weingand said.

"Despite the marvelous accomplishments of modern science, we are still all but helpless before these natural phenomena.

"The toll in California alone in lives and property from forest fires, floods, and earthquakes is appallingly high year after year.

"I am hopeful that the preliminary investigations my resolutions would authorize will suggest some answers. I am hopeful they will help us move toward realizing man's ancient dream of truly mastering the elements and controlling them for his own benefit."

Governor Brown commended the senator "for his interest in this highly important undertaking."

The Governor said studies under contracts already let into four other problem areas—transportation, information collection and control, waste management, and criminal control—"are proceeding extremely well."

"They are proving that the systems analysis approach can be applied to unsolved and expensive problems here at home, and they are justifying my original hope in proposing them," the Governor said.

"Our aim in these undertakings is two-fold. We want to mount a more effective attack on some of the problems we face in California and the Nation that have too long defied the necessary scientific or engineering solutions. At the same time, we can assist the State's aerospace industry to convert part of its activities to nondefense pursuits.

"Our hope ultimately is that California, which now dominates the aerospace scene nationally, will become the research and development center of the Nation in an economy turning increasingly to peaceful pursuits."

The five resolutions authorize the administrator of the resources agency to coordinate the efforts of agency departments in cooperation with the aerospace industry to investigate and seek solutions to the various problems.

Excerpts from the resolutions:

On earthquake cause and prediction: "California has experienced a large number of earthquakes, three of which were of a general magnitude similar to the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in Alaska.

"The occurrence of an earthquake of this general magnitude in a densely populated

A2032

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 28, 1965

area of California would be catastrophic not only to man's works, but to man himself, physically and psychologically.

"Many disciplines of knowledge should be directed to the study of earthquake cause and prediction and on man's proper response to the knowledge so developed."

On forest fire control and prevention "The problems of wild land fire prevention and control have been greatly intensified during the past 20 years by California's population growth and economic expansion resulting in human use of the 37 million acres of wild land and timber."

"Completed research projects lead to the conclusion that direct study of production relationships appear to be an essential prerequisite for further progress toward determining proper economic production goals for fire prevention and fire control programs, operations, and organization."

On flood control planning: "The great floods of December 1964, caused economic and personal damage to vast areas of the State, which demonstrate the need for improved methods of forecasting and controlling floods."

"Present criteria and procedures utilized in evaluating the justification of expenditures for flood control works may not properly account for the long-range impact of a major flood on the economy of an area."

Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article in today's New York Times, a fitting tribute to an unusual man, Edward R. Murrow.

The article follows:

EDWARD R. MURROW, BROADCASTER AND FORMER USA HEAD, DIES

Edward R. Murrow, whose independence and incisive reporting brought heightened journalistic stature to radio and television, died yesterday at his home in Pawling, N.Y., at the age of 57.

The former head of the U.S. Information Agency had been battling cancer since October 1963. He had been in and out of the hospital ever since, and death came 3 weeks after he was discharged from New York Hospital for the last time.

The ever-present cigarette (he smoked 60 to 70 a day), the matter-of-fact baritone voice and the high-domed, worried, lopsided face were the trademarks of the radio reporter who became internationally famous during World War II with broadcasts that started, "This [pause] is London."

Later, on television, his series of news documentaries, "See It Now," on the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1951 to 1958, set the standard for all television documentaries on all networks.

President Johnson, on learning of Mr. Murrow's death, said that all Americans "feel a sense of loss in the death of Edward R. Murrow."

He was, the President said, a "gallant fighter" who had "dedicated his life as a newsman and as a public official to the unrelenting search for truth."

Mr. Murrow died at his home on the rolling hills of his 280-acre Pawling farm shortly before noon.

He is survived by his widow, the former Janet Huntington Brewster; a son, Charles Casey Murrow, a freshman at Yale University; and two brothers, L. V. Murrow, of Washington, and Dewey Murrow, of Spokane, Wash.

A funeral service will be held on Friday at 2 p.m. at St. James Episcopal Church, 865 Madison Avenue, between 71st and 72d Streets. Burial is to be announced.

In many years of receiving honors and tributes, the most recent was conferred on Mr. Murrow on March 5, 1965, by Queen Elizabeth II, who named him an honorary Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

On September 14, 1964, President Johnson awarded him the Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor a President can confer on an American citizen.

Mr. Murrow's career with the Columbia Broadcasting Co. spanned 25 years. It ended in January 1961 when President Kennedy named him head of the U.S. Information Agency.

In October 1963, a malignant tumor made the removal of his left lung necessary, and 3 months later he resigned as head of the Agency. Last November, Mr. Murrow again underwent surgery.

BROUGHT CONTROVERSY INTO HOMES

Mr. Murrow achieved international distinction in broadcasting, first as a radio correspondent reporting from London in World War II and then as a pioneer television journalist opening the home screen to the stimulus of controversy. No other figure in broadcast news left such a strong stamp on both media.

In an industry often given to rule by committee, Mr. Murrow was always recognized as an individual, whether in the front lines of the war, in the executive conferences of a network or, in what he enjoyed most, in planning his next story. His independence was reflected in doing what he thought had to be done on the air and worrying later about the repercussions among sponsors, viewers, and individual stations. The fruits of his determination are shared today by newsmen at all networks; they enjoy a freedom and latitude not yet won by others working in the medium.

Mr. Murrow was a realist about fame. He could not walk a block in New York without pedestrians turning for a look or a bore trying to strike up a conversation. But in the context of television he knew the value of adulation. "It can get a lot of things done," he once remarked. That was his concern.

In the last war, Mr. Murrow conveyed the facts with a compelling precision. But he went beyond the reporting of the facts. By describing what he saw in visual detail, he sought to convey the moods and feelings of war.

Had a London street just been bombed out? The young correspondent was soon there in helmet, gray flannel trousers and sport coat, quietly describing everything he saw against the urgent sound patterns of rescue operations.

Or he would be in a plane on a combat mission, broadcasting live on the return leg and describing the bombing he had watched as "orchestrated hell."

He flew 25 missions in the war, despite the opposition of top executives of the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York, who regarded him as too valuable to be so regularly risked. In the endless German air raids on London, his office was bombed out three times but he escaped injury.

Mr. Murrow, never fevered or high-blown, had the gift of dramatizing whatever he reported. He did so by understatement and by a calm, terse, highly descriptive radio style. Sometimes there was a sort of metallic poetry in his words.

"BLOOD ON THE PANES"

In one memorable broadcast he said that as he "walked home at 7 in the morning, the windows in the West End were red with reflected fire, and the raindrops were like blood on the panes."

For a dozen years, as radio's highest paid newscaster, he was known by voice alone to millions of his countrymen. "This (pause) is London," was his matter-of-fact salutation, delivered in a baritone voice tinged with an echo of doom. Later it was, "This (pause) is the news."

Then television added to the distinctive voice an equally distinctive face, with high-domed forehead and deep-set, serious eyes. Mr. Murrow's casual television manner was superimposed on a quite obvious native tension.

As the armchair interviewer on "Person to Person," Mr. Murrow carried out a gently-manied electronic invasion of the homes of scores of celebrities in the 1950's from Sophie Tucker through the evangelist Billy Graham.

The darkly handsome Mr. Murrow, his brow knotted and two fingers holding his ever-present cigarette, sat in the studio facing a greatly magnified television image of his subjects at home. He would make what one writer called "urbane small talk" with them, generously admiring their children and perhaps inquiring exactly where that handsome vase on the side table had been acquired. It was not momentous, but it was interesting.

SERIES OF DOCUMENTARIES

From 1951 to 1958 Mr. Murrow also did a series of news documentaries under the title "See It Now." In the 1953-54 season the telecast studied the various aspects of the impact of the emotional and political phenomenon known as McCarthyism.

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin, was then conducting his crusade against alleged Communist influence. Some regarded it as a hard, honest search for subversives by a zealous patriot; others saw it as a demagogic opportunism, the exploitation of a real issue for the purpose of gaining political influence by intimidation.

The debate over Senator McCarthy, was supercharged with emotion and fervent belief. Since commercial television thrives by giving little offense, the medium had given the matter gingersly treatment.

Mr. Murrow and his long-time coeditor, Fred W. Friendly, broke this pattern decisively on Wednesday evening, March 10, 1954. Using film clips that showed the Senator to no good advantage, the two men offered a provocative examination of the man and his methods.

The program, many thought, had a devastating effect. McCarthyism did lose public force in succeeding months. "The timing was right and the instrument powerful," Mr. Murrow said to the telecast later.

DECIDED TO GO AHEAD

Jack Gould, television critic of the New York Times, wrote that "Mr. Murrow decided to go ahead with the program at a time when passions in the broadcasting industry were running wild on the issue of Communist sympathizers and dupes. It was the autonomy of the Murrow-Friendly operation, often the source of internal controversy within CBS that got the vital show on the air."

That autonomy was a singular thing in network broadcasting. It was based on Mr. Murrow's immense prestige, initially gained when he became one of the first radio war correspondents and built a superb news staff for CBS in Europe.

Mr. Murrow, one writer said, "has achieved a position at CBS that is outside, and basically antithetical to, the corporate structure of authority" and he thereby enjoyed a large measure of "freedom from authority of all

We do, however, have a fair idea of the conditions in industry which produce concentration and monopoly.

TBA MONOPOLY STRAPPED LEE

The failure of Lee Rubber & Tire Co., for example, can in large measure be traced to that company's loss of business to the TBA monopoly enjoyed almost exclusively by the major producers. We turn to FTC Docket No. 6486, dated March 9, 1961, in the matter of Goodyear's TBA contract with Atlantic Refining Co. There are ample instances found in these FTC allegations to substantiate this claim. Furthermore, it should be noted, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago on April 24, 1964, upheld FTC's case and denied Goodyear's petition to set aside the Government's order to break the TBA contract.

"The success enjoyed by Goodyear *** in selling to Atlantic has been purchased at the expense of competing TBA suppliers," FTC noted. The "competing supplier" in this case happened to be Lee.

Returning to the docket we read this description of events which led to Lee's loss of business (between 1948 and 1950 Atlantic's sales of TBA was \$22 million) to Goodyear, the major company which now has an option to buy the smaller company.

"Sometime in 1932, Atlantic commenced to purchase 'Lee' tires from the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., and to resell such tires to its wholesale and retail petroleum distributors." Note that under this plan Atlantic bought, warehoused, shipped, and sold the tires to its outlets. Thus the oil marketer was competing in the market by performing a distinct economic service. And note too that an Atlantic spokesman commenting on the arrangement with Lee, said: "We receive a good gross margin in keeping with the duties left to us."

Also note that Atlantic's dealers were satisfied with the arrangement. The oil firm conducted a brand-preference survey among its dealers in 1948 and 1949 and got following result; "67 percent of the Atlantic dealers contacted indicated that they would rather obtain their TBA requirements from several sources rather than a single source, the principal reason given therefor being price advantages and the variety of brands."

Notwithstanding, negotiations for exclusive TBA contract between Atlantic and the major tire producers were set in motion. One result was that operations under the so-called "sales commission" plan with Goodyear commenced on an experimental basis in Atlantic's Newark, N.J., section in June 1950. It proved successful to Atlantic and Goodyear. But not for Lee and other small competitors.

Subsequently, Atlantic gave Lee the boot and took on the Goodyear TBA line. An Atlantic official boasted to his superior: "We are relieved of the purchasing function *** do not warehouse or deliver any merchandise, we are not involved in the handling of accounts, we do not issue catalogs or price books nor do we have to provide point-of-sale promotion help." All that Atlantic had to do, he commented, was to "assist in the selling job as well as in the dealer training and merchandising task, and for this effort receive a commission which *** has been averaging well over 9 percent."

Lee vigorously protested the loss of its right to compete in an open market for this business, but in vain. FTC puts it this way: "The sales gain accruing to Goodyear *** was accompanied by a corresponding loss in sales by Lee" even though Lee had opened new factory branches in Hartford, Conn., Providence, R.I., and Syracuse, N.Y., to accommodate this business. Within nine months after Atlantic began sponsoring Goodyear TBA Lee dourly reported that only "25 percent of the Atlantic business will be salvaged this year (1951)."

Lee sales VIP's wrote bitter letters to Atlantic complaining of the methods employed to grease the shift from Lee to Goodyear at Atlantic's outlets. But these mis-sales were exercises in futility.

Another unrewarding dividend derived from such TBA agreements must be pointed out, and that is the devastating effect they have on smaller tire producers who need to build a strong network of distribution through independent dealers. You can assess their chances at success in this vital area when you consider that even the tire distributors of the majors with TBA ties are eliminated in competing for the business of "captured" gas stations. FTC illustrates this point when it charged that "competition among Goodyear wholesalers for the business of Atlantic accounts has been eliminated through the assignment of each Atlantic account to a designated supply point." While there were 1,155 Goodyear dealers in the Atlantic marketing territories assigned to Goodyear only 128 of these dealers were tapped as "supply points." The remainder of Goodyear dealers, like dealers handling smaller company lines, "are substantially foreclosed from access to Atlantic accounts."

Multiply this effect on free competition by the number of TBA agreements in force between the major tire and oil firms and you get an indication of what is involved.

gram of vast potential on the southern Mekong River Delta.

Some 20 nations are working there with remarkable unanimity of purpose on a program begun in 1957 by the U.N. Economic Commission. The plan has such vast popular support that so far the Communists have kept hands off.

Dr. White suggests that the present project, now in the planning and engineering phase, be greatly expanded by the participating nations. The Mekong is to this region what the Mississippi is to the United States, the Nile to northeast Africa, the Amazon to South America, with huge untapped potential for hydroelectric power and agriculture. The benefits of its development would extend all the way to Red China. It would be to the advantage of the nations supplying the economic assistance to join in a multinational police force to assure political stability while the project was underway.

This is but a sketchy outline of a proposal which Bethaea can propound in detail and at length. He believes that if enough people can be sold, their combined voices will be heard in Washington.

RIGHT DIRECTION

Maybe Washington is already tuned in. Last Thursday, President Johnson emerged from a Cabinet meeting with the announcement that the United States would consider a sort of "Marshall plan" of economic and social assistance for Southeast Asia if peace were restored in Vietnam.

The President did not mention the Mekong River development specifically, but the idea would seem to mesh with his thinking. If he has any trouble selling the public on this new direction, Mr. Johnson should have an ardent supporter in Dr. White and his convert in Miami, John Bethaea.

A PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM¹

A peaceful and honorable resolution of the conflict in South Vietnam and Laos may be found in a bold plan for land and water development which already unites factions in four nations of southeast Asia. For 7 years, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam have been working with little publicity and without disagreement on a huge development program. These four countries, which do not cooperate in anything else, have reached accord on development of the Lower Mekong Basin.

Work already is underway in drawing engineering designs, moving earth for dams, building powerplants, cultivating pilot farms, and training village technicians. Even guerrilla troops have not halted field work.

If the United Nations were to designate this area for international development according to the plan already drawn by the four nations, there is a strong possibility that peace could be achieved in a common pursuit of agricultural and industrial growth. This is a solution to southeast Asian violence which would make sense to peasants in rice fields and to American taxpayers ***. The United Nations might be expected to provide a blue-helmeted watch and ward service for those sectors of the project area where security is threatened. It could do this on the invitation of the country concerned. Cambodia and Thailand would have no immediate need beyond protection of their borders. Laos and South Vietnam would find it essential in the areas where civil unrest has been intense ***.

This type of agreement would be fundamentally different from the cease-fire that is

RED ATTITUDE

What makes anyone think the Communists would hold still while all this is going on? No one knows that they would, of course. But optimism springs from the fact that they are already cooperating to some degree in a little-known development pro-

¹ Excerpts from "Lower Mekong," by Gilbert F. White, professor of geography at the University of Chicago. The article was published by the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," December 1964, and reprinted by the American Friends Service Committee, 1185 Sunset Drive, Coral Gables, Fla.

A2036

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 28, 1965

envisioned under a neutralization treaty. The four countries, the United States, North Vietnam, and other interested nations would commit themselves primarily to advance a great development program for the welfare of the people ** *. It would substitute a development goal for an indistinct battle line, and it would permit the United States to withdraw gracefully in favor of an international force committed to that goal. Financial obligations of the United States would in the future be linked with contributions of money and people from other nations.

A PROPOSAL FOR SOLUTION OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

In addition to the obliterating threat of a nuclear war, there are two other overriding issues which threaten the security of all societies. One problem is the unrest and instability of two-thirds of the world's population, which is suffering from malnutrition or worse. Much of this unrest is caused by the fact that these people are beginning to smell the "aroma" of what might be theirs if they could only develop economically. Second, it is common knowledge that there exists in the world an enormous variety of young, emotional national states. These nations have learned well from the history of the older Western nation states. Understandably these young nations make on occasion what might seem to be, from our viewpoint, inappropriate and unrealistic demands.

However, one consistent and valid demand made by these nations is that it be possible for them to achieve a reasonable degree of economic stability. Economic stability is for many of these countries the essential prerequisite to social and political stability. When feasible, the program of development should be an international cooperative venture.

Thus, with the background given by Gilbert White's article, it seems reasonable that the United States might offer to allocate a significant portion of its yearly foreign aid appropriation to the existing international economic venture in the Mekong River Delta. This action would promote long range political and social stability. This type of positive action would meet a common need of all emerging countries—economic development. The project by its very nature would promote regionalism and provide an example of cooperation among small nation states.

The obvious fact is that world peace is the responsibility, militarily and economically, of all nations. The United States should offer to redirect its energies from military to economic development if a group of nations would agree, with the consent of the South Vietnam Government, to bring into South Vietnam a sufficiently large force to help that Government and people maintain their political and territorial integrity.

This plan does not hope that South Vietnam will finally become either capitalistic or socialistic. The end result for all of the small countries in this area will probably be a mixture of both economic systems. This plan does involve the determination that no single country will dominate the peninsula known historically to the westerner as French Indochina. Most nations, including many of the emerging nations, should be willing collectively to resist aggression of this kind.

This plan is an honorable alternative to the present U.S. course of action. In the positive sense of being creative, the Mekong River Delta project promises regionalism and long-range social and political growth.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

JOHN R. BETHEA.

MIAMI, FLA.

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning entry of Miss Melody Jean Smith of Reno, Nev., in the 1965 national "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the Presidents' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Smith won fourth place and will be presented with her award at the opening ceremonies of the committee's annual meeting on April 29.

The essay follows:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Melody Jean Smith, Reno High School, Reno, Nev.)

Addressing the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in April of 1964, President Johnson said, "I am convinced that it is morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible to open the door of employment opportunity to handicapped but job-qualified Americans." Many handicapped individuals in my community have opened that door—the door which leads to their employment and to their acceptance as productive members of society.

That a moral imperative endows every human being with dignity and worth is unquestioned in our society, yet complete social justice has not been attained. There are still many prejudices against handicapped individuals.

Achieving social justice for these handicapped is never the work of a single individual or a single agency. Hundreds of people and many facilities are involved in overcoming barriers to the employment of the handicapped: rehabilitation counselors, physicians, psychologists, social workers, and prosthetic experts; plus rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, and schools. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped has a network of governors' committees and local committees carrying information and inspiration to every part of the country. The work of these groups has resulted in modification of the hiring practices of employers.

One of the great steps made in the past few years has been the removal of architectural barriers such as steep flights of steps and narrow doorways that cannot admit employees confined to wheelchairs. Last year when my community's new multimillion-dollar bank building was completed, Mr. Albert Alegre, the building manager, stated, "The handicapped were considered when this building was planned." A ramp leads to the building's automatic doors, and the elevators, drinking fountains, and restrooms of the interior are easily accessible to the handicapped. A newly built Employment Security Office Building and an almost completed city hall also have street level entrances accessible to the handicapped.

Federal-State agencies working as partners in action have made rehabilitation and placement of the handicapped administratively feasible. Disabled persons are referred to the Division of Vocational Rehabili-

tation from many sources: doctors, schools, welfare agencies, and employment services. Medical data, case study, and an appraisal of the client's ability enable the counselor to work out an individual rehabilitation plan. The services may include medical care, the supplying of artificial limbs, training, transportation, and maintenance during rehabilitation, the supplying of occupational tools and equipment, and job placement.

In my community by means of a grant from the Max C. Fleishmann Foundation, funds from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and contributions from individuals and organizations in Nevada, a much-needed occupational training center is being initiated. This center will provide necessary training for disabled people in order that they may become self-supporting.

The money spent for the construction and operation of this training center is well spent, for rehabilitation of the handicapped is economically sensible. In Nevada, 113 persons were rehabilitated during the fiscal year 1963-64. These individuals had earned \$62,088 annually before rehabilitation; after rehabilitation they were earning \$491,296 annually, an increase of over 600 percent. It is estimated that during the rest of their lives they will pay back about \$10 in income tax for every dollar invested in their rehabilitation.

Hiring the handicapped is also economically sensible for the employer. Publicized studies show that properly placed handicapped persons are equally or more productive than their fellow workers and that they have better attendance and safety records.

Many handicapped persons in my community have overcome the characteristic barriers to employment—social, architectural, prejudicial—and are now proving that "ability counts." Although Mr. Howard McKissick is a disabled veteran, his consistent reelection to the post of county commissioner attests to his efficiency and the voters' gratitude. Mrs. Lillian Barnum, who lost her legs when she was eight, is a dedicated worker for the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In spite of the loss of his right arm, Mr. Howard Farrell is an excellent accountant for the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. Maynard Yasmer, severely crippled by polio, necessitating his being confined to a wheelchair, has achieved distinction as a rehabilitation counselor.

These people are among those who have overcome barriers to employment in my community. Many more need help. This help is being provided by the many agencies and individuals that concern themselves with this problem. Through diligent work, my community is learning that it is "morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible" to rehabilitate and hire the handicapped.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6346, to amend the Federal Firearms Act. These amendments on firearms are not designed to cause injury to the sport-loving public, nor those engaged in legiti-